DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 398 UD 028 778

AUTHOR	Hagen, Jan L.; Lurie, Irene
TITLE	Implementing JOBS: Initial State Choices.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany. Nelson A. Rockefeller Inst. of Government.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C.; Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.; Foundation for Child Development, New York, N.Y.; New York State Dept. of Social Services, Albany.; Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-914341-23-5
PUB DATE	Mar 92
NOTE	174p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Professional Development Program, Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, State University of New York at Albany, 135 Western Avenue, Albany, NY 12222 ($15).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Change; Adult Education; *Agency Role; Basic Skills; *Employment Opportunities; *Federal Programs; Federal State Relationship; Profiles; Program Descriptions; *Program Implementation; State Action; State Federal Aid; State Government; *State Programs; Training; *Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS	Family Support Act 1988; *Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program

ABSTRACT

This report presents the findings from the first of three rounds of research in a projected 3-year study of the way state governments have begun to implement the new Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS). JOBS is a part of the Family Support Act of 1988 and provides employment, education, and training services that recipients need to avoid long-term welfare dependency. This first report is based on information from research conducted shortly after states were required to implement JOBS and includes data from 10 states (Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas), which were selected to represent a range of experiences in JOBS implementation. The report provides an overview of the program designs, policies, and strategies adopted by the state-level organizations in implementing JOBS. The report's 10 sections are: (1) introduction; (2) state profiles; (3) leadership, funding, and organizational change; (4) state program designs and resource allocations; (5) accessing services for JOBS participants; (6) child care and other support services; (7) state choices for client processing; (8) meeting federal reporting requirements; (9) participation in JOBS (mandatory and voluntary); and (10) conclusions. The JOBS legislation has encouraged a moderate shift to a more human investment approach. States are placing less emphasis on immediate job placement and more emphasis on services that will increase the capacity of recipients to achieve self-sufficiency over the long term, as reflected in the expansion of educational components, and, to a lesser degree, in expenditures on case management services. Included are 14 tables, appendixes with information on the field associates and the field network research reporting format, and 26 references. (JB)

ED351398

IMPLEMENTING JOBS:

INITIAL STATE CHOICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jan L Hagen
SUNY at Albany

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Jan L. Hagen
and
Irene Lurie

The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government

State University of New York

UD028778

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Implementing JOBS: Initial State Choices

Jan L. Hagen and Irene Lurie

The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government
State University of New York

March 1992

Produced by the Professional Development Program
Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy
University at Albany, State University of New York

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Richard P. Nathan for his support and encouragement during this study. We also express our appreciation to the state officials and administrators who generously gave of their time and effort to this research project. Their cooperation and support was central to our being able to conduct this research on the implementation of JOBS.

In completing this report, we have been ably supported by the project's research associate, Dr. Ling Wang, as well as a number of research assistants at the University at Albany, State University of New York.

Funding for this project has been provided by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the U.S. Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services, the New York State Department of Social Services, and the Foundation for Child Development. The conclusions and opinions in this report reflect those of the authors and should not be construed as representing those of the funders.

© 1992
Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government
411 State Street, Albany, NY 12203

ISBN 0-914341-23-5

Field Associates

Maryland
Jeffrey J. Koshel, Planning and Evaluation Consultant
Washington, D.C.

Michigan
Colletta H. Moser, Professor
Department of Agricultural Economics
Michigan State University

Minnesota
Sharon K. Patten, Senior Fellow
Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota
Associate Professor
Department of Social Work, Augsburg College

Mississippi
Lewis H. Smith, Professor
Department of Economics
University of Mississippi

New York
Jan L. Hagen, Associate Professor
School of Social Welfare
Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy
University at Albany, State University of New York

Irene Lurie, Associate Professor
Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy
University at Albany, State University of New York

Oklahoma
Kenneth R. Wedel, Professor
School of Social Work
University of Oklahoma

Oregon
Norman L. Wyers, Professor
Graduate School of Social Work
Portland State University

Pennsylvania
Thomas F. Luce, Jr., Assistant Professor
The Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
(Formerly at Pennsylvania State University)

Tennessee
Robert E. Fulton, Public Policy Analyst
Patton, Missouri

Texas
Christopher T. King, Associate Director
Center for the Study of Human Resources
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin

Contents

List of Tables iv

List of Abbreviations v

Executive Summary 1

I. Introduction 21

II. Overview of the States' JOBS Programs 27

State Profiles 33

III. Leadership, Funding, and Organizational Change 45
- Presenting JOBS to the Public 45
- Funding for JOBS 48
- Organizational Change for the Management and Staffing of JOBS 54

IV. State Program Designs and Resource Allocations 57
- Sequences and Choice of Services 58
- Services Selected by the States 60
- JOBS Expenditures on Program Components 64
- Planned Variation in Program Design and Resources 67

V. Accessing Services for JOBS Participants 71
- Interagency Relationships and Contracting for Services 71
- Obtaining Resources on a Non-Reimbursable Basis 75
- Linkages to and Provision of Services by the Job Training Partnership Act 77
- Linkages to and Provision of Educational Services 84

VI. Child Care and Other Supportive Services 93
- Child Care Services 93
- Other Supportive Services 103

VII. State Choices for Client Processing 107
- Providing Information to Clients 107
- Assessments and Employability Plans 109
- Case Management 113

VIII. Meeting the Federal Reporting Requirements 119

IX. Participation in JOBS 125
- Participation in JOBS: Mandatory Versus Voluntary 125
- Meeting the Federal Mandates for Participation Rates and the Targeting of Services 130

X. Conclusions 137

References 144

Appendices
- A. Field Associates 146
- B. State Implementation Reporting Format 148

List of Tables

1. Criteria for Selecting States 24
2. Monthly AFDC Payments and Caseloads 28
3. JOBS Implementation in the Ten States 29
4. Funding for JOBS and Prior Welfare Employment Programs 49, 50
5. Characteristics of State Welfare Employment Programs as of October 1, 1988 ..... 61, 62
6. JOBS Services and Activities Selected by States 63
7. Expected Allocation of Funds for JOBS Services (Excluding Supportive Services and Child Care) Federal Fiscal Year 1991 ..... 65, 66
8. Participation in JTPA Title II-A Programs by Adults on Welfare 81
9. Methods of Payment for Child Care 98
10. Sources of Non-Reimbursable Child Care Services 100
11. Related Coordinated Programs for Child Care 100
12. Supportive Services (Other Than Child Care) for JOBS Participants Specified in the State Plan 104
13. Reported Status of State Welfare Information Systems as of January 1991 120
14. Participation Rates and Expenditures to Target Groups 131

List of Abbreviations

AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
AFDC-UP	Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Unemployed Parent
A-WEP	Alternative Work Experience
CAA	Community Action Agency
CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (1973)
CWEP	Community Work Experience Program
DHS	Department of Human Services
DSS	Department of Social Services
ESL	English as a Second Language
ET	Employment and Training Choices Program (Massachusetts)
ET & E	Education, Training, and Employment Program (Oklahoma)
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
FSA	Family Support Act of 1988
FY	Fiscal Year
GED	General Educational Development Certificate
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
JOBS	Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program
JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act (1982)
MDRC	Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation
MIS	Management Information System
MOST	Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training Program
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
OBRA	Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981
OJT	On-the-Job Training
PI	Project Independence (Maryland)
SDA	Service Delivery Area
SEID	Self-Employment Investment Demonstration
SIET	Self-Initiated Education or Training
SJTCC	State Job Training Coordinating Council
SPOC	Single Point of Contact (Pennsylvania)
WIN	Work Incentive Program

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Family Support Act of 1988 was hailed as a new consensus between liberals and conservatives on welfare reform and as the most sweeping revision in the nation's welfare system in the past 50 years (Rovner, 1988). The Act was also viewed as representing a new social contract between government and welfare recipients (Moynihan, 1990; Lurie & Sanger, 1991). Under this new social contract, government has an obligation to meet the needs of poor families for income and services that may enable them to become economically self-sufficient. Recipients of welfare, in turn, have an obligation to make efforts on their own behalf to achieve self-sufficiency. Additionally, the Act was envisioned as affording an opportunity to improve the well-being of disadvantaged children—as offering the potential to create a two-generational prevention program (Smith, Blank, & Bond, 1990).

The Family Support Act seeks to strengthen the economic self-sufficiency of AFDC recipients through increased child support enforcement and a new Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS). JOBS builds upon previous legislation to provide the employment, education, and training services that recipients need to avoid long-term welfare dependency as well as the child care and other services that support their efforts to prepare for work or take a job. JOBS services are to be targeted toward recipients who are, or are likely to become, long-term recipients of assistance. In a significant departure from previous law, the Act requires participation in JOBS by parents of children age three and over and permits states to extend participation to parents with children as young as age one. States must guarantee child care if it is required for an adult recipient to participate in the JOBS program.

Primary responsibility for JOBS rests with each state's welfare agency, which must offer educational activities including high school or equivalent education, basic and remedial education, and English proficiency education; job skills training; job readiness activities; and job development and job placement. Additionally, states must offer two of the following: group and individual job search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, and community work experience. The federal legislation requires states to provide these JOBS services to 7 percent of the non-exempt caseload in 1990. This mandated rate of JOBS participation increases to 20 percent in 1995.

To assist states in financing their JOBS programs, federal matching funds have been increased significantly. The federal matching rate is 90 percent up to each state's WIN allocation for 1987. Expenditures for JOBS services beyond that amount are matched at the Medicaid rate or 60 percent, whichever is higher. The total federal match is capped at $800 million in 1990, with the cap rising to $1.3 billion in 1995. Federal funding for child care is open-ended and matched at the Medicaid rate, which ranges from 50 to 80 percent.

JOBS is an ambitious piece of legislation, and its implementation presents a major challenge to state and local governments. Recognizing the importance of studying the process of the state and local implementation of JOBS, researchers based at the Rockefeller Institute of Government in Albany, the public policy research arm of the State University of New York, are conducting a 10-state implementation study of the JOBS program extending over three years. This study is assessing the implementation of JOBS by focusing on two areas: the way states have altered their employment and training programs in response to the Family Support Act and the extent to which local welfare agencies have realized the provisions of the JOBS legislation.

To assess the state and local responses to JOBS, three rounds of research will be undertaken. The first round focused on the initial phases of JOBS implementation at the state level—states' choices, program designs, and issues in implementing the legislation. The second round of research focuses on JOBS implementation at the local level—the organizational structure and process for delivering services and the resulting opportunities for recipients. The third round will assess the changes made as the states and local agencies gain experience with the JOBS program and come under increasing pressure from the federal mandates to serve more AFDC recipients in their JOBS programs.

This report presents the findings from the first round of research conducted between October and December 1990, shortly after states were required to implement JOBS. The 10 states included in this study are Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas. States were selected to illustrate a range of experiences in JOBS implementation. In selecting the states, we considered a number of criteria, including prior experience with welfare employment programs, level of state fiscal stress expected in 1990, poverty rate, per capita income, and state or local administration of public welfare.

The primary research approach to assessing the states' choices in the initial phases of implementing JOBS was field network research (Nathan, 1982). The essential feature of this approach is a network of indigenous field researchers familiar with the programs and political processes of each sample jurisdiction. These field researchers, who are senior policy analysts, assess the program in their jurisdiction using a uniform instrument for collecting and analyzing information. Field researchers gathered the required information in a variety of ways, including on-site observations, interviews with state officials and program staff, and reviews of program materials and reports. This method allows for the synthesis of diverse types of information on a range of topics and for data collection to occur during the actual process of implementation.

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the program designs, policies, and strategies adopted by the state-level organizations in their response to the federal JOBS legislation. The findings are based on structured reports submitted by the field researchers for each of the 10 states which reflect state policies as well as the intentions and perspectives of state-level officials and administrators. As such, this report is not an assessment of the nature or extent of JOBS services provided to AFDC recipients; this requires research at the local level, which is the next step in the study. While the scope of this report has this limitation, we believe it contains timely information of interest to those concerned with the implementation of JOBS and with the developing character of state welfare employment programs.

Findings

The analysis of JOBS implementation was organized around the central provisions of the federal legislation, such as the delivery of mandated and optional JOBS services, the targeting of services on specific groups of recipients, the federally mandated rates of program participation, coordination with providers of JTPA and educational services, and the guarantee of child care services. Additionally, other factors related to program implementation were considered. These factors include the political climate for implementation and the funding for services. We have organized the presentation of our findings around these major themes of JOBS implementation.

LEADERSHIP AND FUNDING

In tracking the implementation of JOBS, we considered whether state leaders presented JOBS to the public as a major federal initiative requiring a significant state response. We then examined the extent to which state legislatures appropriated funds for JOBS in response to the increased federal matching funds and mandates for program operations.

Presenting JOBS to the Public

The Family Support Act was presented to the nation as a new social contract between government and welfare recipients that would change the focus of welfare from a cash assistance program to an education, training, and employment program. Did governors and other state officials mobilize support and resources for this vision of welfare reform as states framed their response to the federal legislation?

In contrast to the dramatic introduction of the JOBS program on the federal level, elected and appointed leaders in the study states introduced JOBS with relatively little fanfare. The low profile given to JOBS implementation at the state level stems from the fact that many of the states in the sample had welfare-to-work programs prior to JOBS and had already charted a course in keeping with the objectives of the federal legislation. The low profile introduction of JOBS was also fostered by the revenue shortfalls faced by many states as well as states' having established other initiatives, such as education, as state priorities.

In designing welfare-to-work programs, states must address many potentially contentious issues. Several states, including Minnesota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania, had already debated many of these issues in designing their earlier welfare employment programs. Maryland was able to avoid public debate through the strong leadership of its governor. In New York, an extended debate accompanied the passage of the state's enabling legislation and focused on such fundamental philosophical issues as the mandatory nature of the program, the emphasis on high-cost versus low-cost services, and the type of preferred child care arrangements. But Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas have yet to begin a public debate. In the absence of debate or visible leadership, efforts to implement JOBS in these states have been modest.

Funding for JOBS

The Family Support Act increases federal financing for welfare employment programs, matching state's expenditures up to a limit that depends on its welfare caseload. How have states responded to the more generous federal support?

States are making widely varying efforts to fund JOBS. The majority are spending considerably more on JOBS than on previous welfare employment programs. Oregon plans to spend enough, or almost enough, to draw down its full allocation of federal funds, while Mississippi and Tennessee have appropriated very limited additional revenues for JOBS services. Administrators in half the states attributed their states' decisions to limit expenditures to constrained fiscal conditions. Funding may also have been restricted for JOBS by the need to comply with mandates of the Family Support Act to provide AFDC-UP benefits, child care, and transitional benefits.

Based on the states' projections of their JOBS expenditures and preliminary information for federal fiscal year 1991, states can be divided into four groups.

Low expenditure states—Mississippi and Tennessee—are drawing down less than 15 percent of their federal entitlement of JOBS funds. A middle group—Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas—are spending enough to draw down 35 to 50 percent of their federal entitlement. Maryland, Minnesota, and Oklahoma are receiving between 55 and 70 percent of their potential funds, and Oregon is expected to draw down almost all of its federal entitlement.

Expenditures in the 10 study states are on average slightly lower than those in the rest of the country, although some study states are considerably above average. The ten states together drew down 43 percent of their entitlement of federal funds for 1991. Nationally, states claimed 48 percent of the federal funds allotted for this period. These levels of expenditures are a disappointment for those who expected the states to respond with the enthusiasm for JOBS expressed by its supporters at the time of enactment. These funding levels give only a partial picture of the extent of services for JOBS participants because states are drawing on other resources such as the JTPA and educational services to implement JOBS; however, "access to services is guaranteed only by JOBS financing," as one administrator noted. If welfare agencies can be certain of obtaining services for their clients only when they have funds to purchase services, the lack of state funding for JOBS is a source of concern.

STATE PROGRAM DESIGNS AND RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS

In part, the significance of the Family Support Act rests on its requirement that the states provide specific education, training, and employment services to welfare recipients. However, states retain considerable discretion in developing their JOBS programs. This study examined the states' choices for program design, including the flow of clients through selected components. These designs for JOBS depend in part on the amount of resources allocated to the programs' component activities and services as well as the extent to which resources from other programs are used for JOBS participants.

Sequence and Choice of Services

Have states designed their JOBS programs to provide a set sequence of services, or are the services provided by JOBS tailored to individual abilities and needs? Are some services being emphasized over others?

In general, states have chosen an assessment-based design that does not specify a fixed sequence of services or emphasize one particular service over another. The sequence and choice of services is based on each participant's assessed abilities and needs. An exception is that some states refer job-ready participants to a particular set of employment services without a full assessment.

Assessment-based programs are desirable if they promote referral to the services most needed by clients. When the full range of services is available, each participant can be assessed and referred to a set of services tailored to her unique needs. Assessment-based programs also have the advantage of giving the local agency flexibility to offer services that meet the needs of local labor markets and that draw upon the resources of the community. However, an assessment-based design does not guarantee that participants will obtain the services that they need. When the availability of services is limited, an assessment-based approach may mean that clients are, in practice, assessed as needing the services that are available. Unlike programs with a prescribed set and sequence of services, no services are guaranteed in an assessment-based approach.

Services Selected by the States

What education, training, and employment services are offered, and how do they differ from the services available prior to JOBS?

All states offer the mandatory services and have elected to offer job search and on-the-job training. Michigan, Minnesota, and New York have also elected both work supplementation and CWEP, while Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania offer either work supplementation or CWEP. While most states offered some or all of these services prior to JOBS, JOBS permitted states to expand coverage to all parts of the state, serve more people, and increase the emphasis on education.

States have responded to JOBS by making incremental changes in the design of their welfare employment programs. For many states, the mandate to perform an initial assessment and to offer a variety of educational services has required new procedures and a change in emphasis. In contrast, the mandate to provide two of the four elective employment-related activities has resulted in few new types of services in most states. In general, for those states that had taken significant initiatives prior to JOBS, the federal legislation required minor modifications and "fine tuning." For the other states, resource limitations restricted their ability to undertake major new initiatives.

Faced with federally mandated participation rates and the necessity for statewide operation by 1992, states have given priority to expanding the scope of the program. They have extended program coverage to more jurisdictions and individuals, making the availability of services more uniform across the state. Additionally, greater emphasis is being placed on educational services.

JOBS Expenditures on Program Components

Which services and activities are being financed with JOBS funds? How are states allocating their JOBS funds among components of the program?

States expect to spend their JOBS funds in very different ways. Most states that implemented JOBS shortly after it was authorized are spending significant amounts on education and training. Those that delayed implementation are devoting a large share of their resources to the client processing tasks of assessment, employability planning, and case management.

Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania, with relatively generous resources and prior experience in operating welfare employment programs, are using their JOBS resources to obtain education and training opportunities for JOBS clients. States with less generous resources are using their resources more strategically to meet the federal participation mandates. In the absence of enough funds to purchase services, Mississippi and Texas are funding case managers who are expected to refer JOBS participants to other programs. Resources other than JOBS funds are helping to support these programs. This is most clear in Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, which are spending small amounts of JOBS funds on some or all of their JOBS services. These state welfare agencies are clearly counting on the services of other organizations to implement the program. While this is less obvious in other states, most of their welfare agencies are also implementing JOBS with the expectation that other organizations will contribute their resources to JOBS participants.

ACCESSING SERVICES FOR JOBS PARTICIPANTS

In addition to providing services directly and obtaining them without payment from other agencies, welfare agencies may also purchase JOBS services from other agencies through contracts and agreements. In examining the implementation of JOBS, we considered the use of purchase of services by welfare agencies. Additionally, the federal legislation encouraged the development of coordination

and linkage between the state welfare agency and the JTPA as well as educational providers.

Contracting for Services

To what extent does the state welfare agency contract with other agencies for JOBS services?

Although responsibility for administering JOBS is lodged with the welfare agency, other agencies that provide JOBS services share in its operation. All states except Oklahoma contract with other agencies to provide a substantial share of JOBS services. The JTPA is the sole state contractor in Maryland and Tennessee. State or local welfare agencies in all other states except Mississippi and Oklahoma contract with the JTPA for selected services or in selected localities. Some state welfare agencies have contracted with a small number of provider organizations, while the Michigan state welfare agency and local New York agencies have negotiated contracts with a great variety of state and local agencies.

The practice of contracting for services helps explain why states are experiencing delays and difficulty in reporting on the distribution of expenditures among JOBS components as required by the federal government. Most states write contracts or allocate funds for a program or for a set of services, rather than for specific components. Tracking expenditures on specific components requires the collection of information that may not be generated in the course of program operations.

Obtaining Resources from Other Programs

To what extent are education, training, and employment services for JOBS participants being funded from sources other than JOBS?

In all states, JOBS participants are being served by education, training, and employment programs other than those funded by JOBS. Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas are relying on other programs for a large share of the services for JOBS participants. While other states cannot estimate the value of services financed by other programs, they are implementing JOBS with the expectation that significant amounts of resources will be drawn from other organizations.

Under the Family Support Act, states are expected to refer JOBS participants to services in the community that are already available to them. Significant resources for JOBS participants are being obtained from other agencies through interagency coordination. The JTPA and educational agencies are important sources of services in all states and are discussed more fully below. To go beyond this generalization is difficult, however. In the majority of states, it is not possible to estimate the share of services that are being purchased with JOBS funds, compared to the share being obtained from other programs without payment.

In three states, the approximate share of services being obtained from other programs without payment is fairly clear. Tennessee, Texas, and Mississippi are expecting to obtain most education, employment, and training services from other programs.

In most states, the services obtained from other agencies through coordination are a significant addition to the services purchased with JOBS funds. In states that are spending relatively large amounts for JOBS services, coordination appears to have the intended effect of accessing services for JOBS participants that are already available in the community. However, low expenditure states are relying on the resources of other agencies as an alternative to appropriating new funds for JOBS services. When welfare agencies are dependent on the resources of other agencies and AFDC recipients must compete with other groups for these limited resources, there is no assurance that JOBS clients will be adequately served.

Linkages to and Provision of Services by the Job Training Partnership Act

In what ways and to what extent has the JTPA assisted in JOBS implementation?

The JTPA is playing a major role in JOBS implementation in all 10 states included in the study. In all states, formal interagency agreements have been negotiated between the JTPA and the welfare agency at the state or local levels. In eight of the states, these are financial contracts for services to be performed by the JTPA. In Maryland and Tennessee, the JTPA has been given the lead responsibility for administering all or most components of JOBS. Additionally, in all states the JTPA is serving AFDC recipients with its own funds, but it is unclear whether more or fewer JTPA resources are being devoted to AFDC recipients than before JOBS implementation.

JOBS has consolidated and extended the formal linkages between welfare agencies and JTPA agencies in all 10 states. In Maryland and Tennessee, the JTPA agency has lead responsibility for administering most components of JOBS and for serving all JOBS participants. In Minnesota and Pennsylvania, JOBS draws on the JTPA infrastructure for management and service delivery. In other states, JTPA agencies have less overall responsibility for operating JOBS, but remain important providers of services for JOBS participants. In eight states, state or local JTPA agencies are being paid as contractors to the welfare agencies.

Whether JOBS implementation has increased or decreased the JTPA resources devoted to JOBS participants is unclear at this time. However, JTPA officials in several states argued that it is in their programs' best interests to serve JOBS participants. For example, Tennessee officials initially offered to serve AFDC recipients as a way of positioning the JTPA system to be the state's primary resource for providing employment and training services for the unemployed and disadvantaged. Others consider JOBS as a way for the service delivery areas to survive financially in the face of declining JTPA funds. Finally, JTPA officials also mentioned that JOBS has made AFDC clients more attractive to serve because supportive services come "attached to the client." These funds lower the cost of serving JOBS clients and potentially enable them to be placed in longer-term training.

JTPA agencies are likely to continue to play a major role in JOBS as contractors to welfare agencies. But whether JTPA resources will continue to support JOBS is less certain, given JTPA's ability to serve only a small fraction of those eligible for its services and the potential increased availability of funding for JOBS participants.

Linkages to and Provision of Educational Services

One of the most significant features of the Family Support Act is the emphasis given to education. For the first time, federal funds are authorized for educational services as a major strategy to reduce welfare dependency. What emphasis are states giving to educational services under JOBS, and what is the role of state education agencies in the JOBS programs?

The role of educational services in welfare-to-work programs is perceived by state administrators as having increased as a result of JOBS or state initiated welfare-to-work programs preceding JOBS. States project at least modest increases in the number of participants receiving educational services and in expenditures for these services under JOBS. The role of state education agencies in state JOBS programs is an emerging one. States have established, or are beginning to establish, linkages between state welfare and education agencies through both financial and non-financial interagency agreements for services. Four states have developed specific mechanisms for fostering the coordination of welfare and education services on the local level.

For the states included in this study, the role of state education agencies in state welfare-to-work programs may be characterized as an emerging one. State education agencies, in general, are the newest players in welfare employment programs,

and the states are in various stages of establishing relationships between the state welfare and education agencies.

States such as Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Pennsylvania have been placing emphasis on educational services in their welfare employment programs for a number of years. But, for other states, program developments or modifications have been necessary to respond to the educational mandates of the JOBS legislation. For example, Maryland responded to the federal legislation by modifying its welfare employment program to provide remedial educational opportunities for 2,000 clients under age 21. Texas devoted a significant share of its increased funding for JOBS services to education for adult JOBS participants. The effect of the legislation's strong emphasis on education, even in states with well developed welfare employment programs, was captured well by one state administrator: "The implementation of JOBS for us is basically an implementation placing a heavier emphasis on education."

The Family Support Act's emphasis on education and the associated availability of federal funding for educational services provided through the JOBS program have encouraged the states in this study to at least maintain, if not increase, the emphasis given to educational services in welfare employment programs. Even at this initial stage of JOBS implementation, the legislation has fostered an increase in the provision of educational services to those participating in the states' JOBS programs. Further, although the linkages between state education and welfare agencies are just beginning in most states, the legislation has provided an incentive for these interagency relationships to develop and expand in most states.

The 20-hour rule for participation poses a number of difficulties for the states in providing all levels of educational services, from adult basic education to college programs. Assuming the continuation of the 20-hour rule, state agencies may need to negotiate for, or contract with, local educational providers for educational programs, or educational programs combined with other activities, that will facilitate meeting the federal requirements for scheduling, on average, 20 hours a week of JOBS activities for participants. In addressing this issue, states may need to decide if separate classes should be designed for JOBS participants or if JOBS participants should be enrolled in classes open to the community generally. Separating JOBS participants from others may have the advantage of allowing programs to be tailored more specifically to their needs, including meeting the 20-hour rule and establishing mechanisms for monitoring attendance. However, concerns have been raised that this may create a two-tiered system of adult education in local communities and increase the stigma experienced by public assistance recipients. The 20-hour rule becomes particularly problematic for college education in which 12 to 15 hours of course work is considered full-time enrollment.

CHILD CARE AND OTHER SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Child care and other supportive services may be critical factors in facilitating participation in JOBS by AFDC recipients. The Family Support Act recognizes the importance of these services by increasing the funding for child care services and by authorizing states to provide a range of other supportive services, including transportation, work-related expenses, and other work-related supportive services such as parenting and life-skills training, counseling, and substance abuse remediation. Work-related supportive services may also include services to the children of participants, if these are required for JOBS participation. The provisions for

child care and other supportive services represent potential avenues for recognizing the two-generational potential of JOBS.

Child Care Services

The Family Support Act recognizes the availability of child care as a critical factor in facilitating participation in JOBS by requiring that child care be guaranteed for children of AFDC participants in JOBS activities and by significantly liberalizing public financing for child care. Is the availability of child care services and funding expected to restrict access to the states' JOBS programs?

At the time of the study, state administrators did not expect the availability of child care services or funding to affect the states' abilities to achieve the federally mandated participation rate of 7 percent for 1990 and 1991. However, the lack of sufficient child care funds has already required, or may require in the future, limiting access to the JOBS programs. Tennessee and Texas recognize the potential need to restrict program access in the future because of insufficient child care funding. To control child care costs in its program, Minnesota restricted access to JOBS in May 1990 by narrowing the groups eligible for services.

New York was the only state to indicate a concern about an adequate supply of child care slots to meet the needs of JOBS participants. It is also the only state with an explicit policy regarding parental choice: if a client requests assistance in locating child care, state law requires that the client be offered two choices of regulated providers.

Since the implementation of JOBS, states have not experienced major changes in the types of child care used, or the extent to which a particular type of care is used by welfare recipients. There are suggestions from both Maryland and Texas, however, that informal child care may be expanding. Under the JOBS program in Texas, the range of child care options has increased: parents now have the choice of using self-arranged care provided by neighbors, friends, or non-parenting relatives. This suggests that more child care used by welfare recipients may be provided in informal settings as the JOBS program expands.

The states included in this study have not enacted formal policies which explicitly encourage one type of child care over another, i.e., regulated care vs. unregulated care. However, some policies adopted across the states regarding child care placement priorities, payment procedures, and varying payment amounts depending on the type of child care arrangement may indirectly establish preferences. Across the states, unregulated care is reimbursed at lower rates than regulated care, and its use could potentially conserve state funds. If state funds for child care are constrained, the lower rates of reimbursement for unregulated care could indirectly promote its use as the preferred type of child care arrangement for JOBS participants. Alternatively, the lower costs associated with informal child care could lead to a type of "creaming" in which those who have access to informal child care are given preference or priority for participation in JOBS programs.

Three states in the study have developed child care management systems to operate in conjunction with child care for JOBS and for transitional benefits. Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas have all established contracts with regionally based agencies to handle specific aspects of child care, including administration of child care payments and state and federal reporting.

At the time of the field research, access to child care for JOBS participants was not a significant concern to state administrators. In general, state administrators perceived both the supply of child care slots and funding for child care as adequate at this time. Some may regard this finding as somewhat unexpected, particularly given current information about the availability of child care in general. There are, however, several possible explanations for this finding. First, given the numbers of participants served at this point in implementing JOBS, states may well have allo-

cated sufficient funding for child care, and the availability of child care services may be sufficient to meet the current demand. Second, in some states, most people are participating in JOBS on a voluntary basis. It is possible that those volunteering for the JOBS program have fewer needs for child care than other potential JOBS participants. Third, recipients with significant needs for child care may be viewed as having a barrier to program participation and thus may be less likely to be enrolled in JOBS activities. Given the need to serve only 7 percent of the potential JOBS pool, states may be choosing to serve those with lower needs for child care—in effect, creaming on the basis of child care needs. Finally, it may also be that the availability of child care services is an issue faced more directly at the local level, and this will be considered in the next round of research.

Other Supportive Services and Work-Related Expenses

The Family Support Act makes provisions for states to reimburse the costs of transportation, work-related expenses, and work-related supportive services, including supportive services to the children of JOBS participants. It is through these provisions, as well as others, that the Family Support Act offers the potential to serve vulnerable children and their families. Is the lack of transportation expected to limit JOBS participation? Has the emphasis given to the supportive service needs of JOBS participants and their children increased as a result of the JOBS legislation?

For those states with less well-developed welfare employment programs, the provision of supportive services (other than child care) has increased under JOBS. Although not a pressing issue at the state level, transportation is recognized as a potential problem, particularly in rural areas. At this stage of implementation, states have not elected to use JOBS funds in any significant manner to provide new or expanded services to children.

Based on the states' plans for supportive services and the field information, the findings suggest that states, in general, have not elected to use JOBS funds in any significant manner to provide new or expanded supportive services to the children of participants, nor have the states taken any major initiatives to link families of JOBS participants to comprehensive family and children's services. This does not necessarily mean that children are not receiving services as a result of JOBS. States may in fact be drawing on other available community resources to address the needs of children as identified in the assessment and employability plan.

STATE CHOICES FOR CLIENT PROCESSING

For JOBS participants, entry into the program begins with an introduction to JOBS followed by an initial assessment and the development of an employability plan. In completing these tasks, as well as in linking clients to their JOBS activities, case managers may play a pivotal role.

Assessment and Employability Plan

Within broad parameters, states are required to conduct assessments and develop employability plans for clients prior to participation in JOBS. What do the state agencies envision as the purpose of the assessment, and to what extent are the needs of a participant's children considered?

In 7 of the 10 states, the assessment is viewed as a comprehensive gathering of information used to design the employability plan. In contrast, Oregon and Pennsylvania use the initial assessment to determine the level of the client's job readiness. For clients entering selected program tracks, a more complete assessment is completed in these states. Texas also tracks clients, but uses screening to do so; assessments are conducted after a client is assigned to a service track. With the possible exceptions of Minnesota and New York, states have not elected to use the assessment process as an opportunity to identify and consider the special needs of children.

In general, states have established procedures and guidelines for the process and content of assessment and employability plans that closely follow those mandated by the federal legislation or regulations. In most of the study states, the content delineated for the assessment provides basic information on the client's background and barriers to employment. Some states, however, envision a more comprehensive assessment for JOBS participants. The model developed by Mis-

sissippi attends not only to the client's educational levels and work experience, but also includes the client's "dreams" and goals, her support system, and related areas that highlight clients' strengths, hopes, and aspirations.

In implementing the requirements for assessments and employability plans, wide discretion is retained by local providers, whether they are situated in the welfare agency or another agency. In some instances, this discretion has been included in the state's vision of JOBS or has occurred because of limitations on state authority to mandate procedures. In other instances, the discretion results from the nature of the work itself. At least one of the study states has recognized its lack of control over and information about assessments and employability plans and is now developing a local monitoring protocol to follow the implementation of assessment and employability plans at the local levels.

The initial assessment phase offers states the opportunity to identify and consider any special needs of children. By incorporating the needs of participants' children in the assessment, and subsequently in the employability plan, JOBS offers the potential for becoming a two-generational program. At the time of this study, the findings suggest that although states acknowledge the importance of children's needs, only New York and Minnesota have emphasized this potential opportunity. New York requires that the assessment for all clients include consideration of any special needs of the child, and Minnesota requires the inclusion of screening information from other programs, if it is available. In addition, the state agency in Oregon places particular emphasis on maternal and child health in a special program for young parents.

Case Management

Case management is an optional service under JOBS and may be provided to both the participant and her family. Have states elected to offer case management services, and what model of case management is being used?

Nine states offer case management services, with most of these using a generalist model of case management in which one person fulfills all the case management functions. Maryland and Pennsylvania have opted to use a team approach to case management that involves front-line workers from several agencies. The only state not officially providing case management is Oklahoma. However, their approach to integrating income maintenance and social services functions suggests that case management services, as commonly defined, are in fact being provided to JOBS participants in the state.

A potential issue confronting states in their use of case managers is the balance between fostering high levels of client contact and associated supportive counseling on one hand and the demands for data entry and reports on client participation and child care and supportive services payments on the other. If caseload size and information processing assigned to case managers are not carefully monitored, case managers may be unable to fulfill the roles envisioned for them, particularly individualizing service planning, providing on-going supportive service to clients, and maintaining service continuity for client participation.

Some states have identified case management as a strategy, or the main strategy, for providing integrated services in a timely and continuous fashion. The ability of case managers to perform this function will be dependent on the size of the caseloads, the system demands for reporting, and the availability as well as accessibility of resources in the JOBS programs and the local community.

MEETING THE FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Family Support Act requires substantial data reporting by the states to the Department of Health and Human Services for the JOBS program and related child care provisions. To provide the required information, as well as to effectively operate JOBS programs, it is expected that automated, client-based information will be needed. What is the capacity of the states' current management information systems for responding to these new reporting requirements, and what challenges are presented to the states?

Although most states had adequate information systems for data collection and reporting demands prior to JOBS, no state's current information system had the capacity to respond adequately to the new reporting requirements. The states are facing major challenges in collecting the required information on JOBS participation and in the design and development of JOBS automated systems for the electronic transfer of information.

Although states are in various stages of complying with the federal JOBS data reporting requirements, a number of common concerns face the states. First, HHS did not specify the format and elements of JOBS data reporting requirements until March 28, 1991. As states planned their information systems, they confronted a lack of explicit federal guidelines, particularly those that regulate the electronic transmission of data. Second, state administrators were concerned about the high cost associated with the system changes required by JOBS. This concern was especially shared by states with relatively large welfare caseloads and an existing, complex management information system.

A third area of concern related to more operational and technical issues as management information systems become more sophisticated and automated, especially due to JOBS data reporting requirements. One issue is staff training and retraining—new technologies associated with automation of information systems require on-going staff training and retraining which few welfare agencies believe they could handle with ease. Another issue involves the validity of the data collected and entered into the information system. Administrators expressed concern that welfare staff have already been working under high pressures, with large caseloads and not enough time to insure accuracy. With JOBS data reporting requirements, welfare staff will be asked to collect more information from each of their clients.

PARTICIPATION AND JOBS

Within the Family Support Act, participation is a multi-dimensional concept that places expectations on both the state and the recipient—the state to make JOBS activities and supportive services available, with a special focus on serving those at high-risk for long-term welfare dependency; the recipient to actively participate in JOBS activities in order to become economically self-sufficient. Participation thus becomes an expression of the mutual obligation underlying the legislation. For the purposes of analysis, we have separated participation into two broad areas: 1) the states' choices for prioritizing clients for JOBS services and the extent to which program participation is viewed as voluntary or mandatory, and 2) the federal mandates requiring states to meet or exceed specific participation rates and to spend at least 55 percent of their JOBS expenditures on selected target groups.

Participation in JOBS: Mandatory Versus Voluntary

The recipient's obligation to participate in JOBS is not well defined by the Family Support Act, which contains language consistent with both mandatory and voluntary participation. In setting policies for enrolling participants, how did states strike a balance between the mandatory and voluntary elements in JOBS?

Although participation is nominally mandatory for all non-exempt recipients under the Family Support Act, resource limitations have led states to set policies that make participation voluntary for many of them. Tennessee and, with a few exceptions, Minnesota have an official policy of limiting enrollment in JOBS to volunteers. The majority of the other states give high priority to volunteers or to volunteers within the target groups. At this stage in program implementation, administrators do not view the threat of sanctions as a major strategy for encouraging program participation.

Most states have developed policies that give volunteers high priority for participation in JOBS. Tennessee has a formal policy, for one year only, of limiting enrollment to those who volunteer for the program. Although there are exceptions, Minnesota also has a formal policy emphasizing services to volunteers. Participation is nominally mandatory in other states, but volunteers are given priority for service. In Michigan and Pennsylvania, most participants are in practice volunteers. Mississippi and New York give priority to volunteers, while Maryland, Oklahoma and Texas give priority to volunteers, but take into account target group status as well. Only in Oregon are volunteers not given the highest priority for service.

Meeting the Federal Mandates for Participation Rates and the Targeting of Services

The Family Support Act requires states to achieve specific rates of participation and to allocate at least 55 percent of their JOBS expenditures to target group members. What is the states' status in achieving these goals, and to what extent did these federal mandates require significant programmatic responses?

In the period of this study, all of the study states expected to meet both the participation rates and the targeting requirements for federal fiscal year 1991. The targeting requirements are not a major issue for any state, probably because the non-exempt caseloads are heavily composed of target group members. Responding to the 7 percent participation rate requirement did not require any major programmatic changes for the states in this study with relatively well developed welfare-to-work programs. However, the 20-hour rule has been of some concern in terms of the match between the requirement to schedule 20 hours of participation and the availability of existing education and training programs, as well as the accounting mechanisms necessary to average and to track the scheduled hours of participation. It is particularly noteworthy that, by itself, full-time enrollment in a two- or four-year college program does not meet the 20-hour rule for JOBS participation.

Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania had been operating employment and training programs that were well developed, and the federal requirement for a 7 percent participation rate did not necessitate major programmatic changes. In Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, the states are now developing programs in line with the federal legislation, and it is premature at this point to project their capacity to meet the 7 percent requirement.

States have developed a variety of methods for attempting to insure that they will meet the federal mandates for rates of participation and for the targeting of expenditures. One approach has been to focus resources on particular groups of recipients, especially volunteers who are non-exempt target group members, or on a specific service track within a state's JOBS program. For example, Tennessee has elected to operate a completely voluntary program. Mississippi and Texas have identified recipients from the federally mandated target groups generally as their service priority. Other states have established different service priorities by drawing from the federally mandated target groups selectively or in combination with other recipient categories. Pennsylvania relies on a specific track within its

JOBS program to meet the federal mandates. The Single Point of Contact program, which provides intensive services to JOBS clients through case management and guaranteed service access using JOBS funds, is designed to fulfill both of the federal requirements.

A second approach for meeting the federal mandates for participation rates and the targeting of expenditures has been to place direct responsibility for meeting the participation rates and targeting requirements on the local service districts or on the JOBS contractor through an interagency contractual agreement. This approach is used in New York, Oklahoma, and Tennessee. In Oklahoma, the state assists the local welfare offices in meeting these standards by providing them with on-going information about their performance, thus allowing the local offices to take corrective actions should they be necessary to meet the mandates. In Minnesota, counties are required to spend 55 percent of their funds on target group members. However, the state does not have the statutory authority to require the counties to meet a specific participation rate. The state can simply encourage the counties to do so.

A third approach has been to adjust programming to meet the 20-hour rule, for example by expanding the number of hours for educational services. Additionally, case managers are encouraged to design program activities for participants that meet the 20-hour rule and to promote continuous participation among clients. A fourth approach involves developing and using management information systems to more completely "capture" JOBS activities provided by contractors which will count toward the participation requirements.

Another approach is to enroll participants in other programs into JOBS, which can be accomplished by giving them an assessment and perhaps supportive services. In both Minnesota and Texas, and probably other states as well, many AFDC participants in the JTPA are also enrolled in JOBS and counted as JOBS participants. In Michigan and New York, and possibly other states as well, significant numbers of JOBS participants are engaged in other educational and training programs and have enrolled in JOBS to obtain supportive services. Their participation in JOBS may be counted as self-initiated activity.

Eight states did not project any major program changes in response to the increasing participation rates. The strategies in these states are to extend the program to additional areas or to increase the service capacity of current programs. Two states do recognize that they may have to make significant adjustments to meet the 11 percent participation rate, possibly adding lower cost components in order to come into compliance. An example of this type of approach might be to enroll in JOBS all AFDC recipients over age 16 who are already full-time students.

The 20-hours per week requirement represents a significant challenge to states to provide intensive JOBS components. Among the concerns regarding this requirement are the match between the required 20 hours of participation and the programmed hours for existing educational and training programs and the exclusion of supportive services such as counseling in meeting the 20-hours per week requirement. Although the state agency is not required to maintain attendance records for JOBS participants, the state does need to require the maintenance of attendance records by service providers. These extensive reporting requirements may create disincentives for other agencies to coordinate and cooperate in providing JOBS services. In addition to tracking the participants' attendance, the calculations for combined and averaged scheduled hours for participants present a difficult accounting problem for the state agencies.

The increasing rates of participation, combined with the targeting requirements, will place challenging demands on state and local agencies operating JOBS programs. Although only two states indicated concern about these demands, it is not unreasonable to expect that as states begin to confront the increasing participation rates, other states may become concerned about their capacity to meet these expectations. When the increasing participation rate requirements are combined with the increasing severity of budgetary constraints faced by state and local governments, states may be faced with difficult choices.

Conclusions

Looking across the responses of the 10 states to the Family Support Act, we can divide them into three groups. The first group—Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania—had introduced welfare employment programs during the 1980s. With the exception of New York, where public debate delayed passage of the state's enabling legislation, all implemented JOBS early, in July or October of 1989. For this group of states with well developed welfare-to-work programs, only relatively small adjustments were required to comply with the federal legislation. These states had already charted a course that was consistent with the federal legislation, and the required response was one of fine tuning an existing program. Changes have been subtle rather than dramatic, incremental rather sweeping. The federal legislation supported and reinforced initiatives these states had chosen earlier. With the increase in federal funding, they were able to expand their programs to all parts of the state, extend services to more people, and increase the emphasis on education.

The second group of states, comprised of Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, had elected to operate WIN Demonstration programs, but had not taken advantage of the opportunity to introduce major welfare-to-work initiatives. They did not have programs in place that could, with minor modification, meet the requirements of the JOBS legislation. Their earlier approach to reducing welfare dependency and welfare costs was to maintain low AFDC benefit levels rather than to emphasize self-sufficiency through employment programs. These states, along with Oklahoma, were also required by the Family Support Act to extend AFDC to two-parent families. To prepare for the changes called for by the federal legislation and to postpone the financial burden they imposed, these three states delayed JOBS implementation until the mandatory date of October 1990.

When this second group of states did implement JOBS, their legislatures made small appropriations to support it. Although state administrators are making a good faith effort to implement the program, their ability to purchase services is extremely limited. As a result, they have designed their programs with the immediate goal of meeting the federal participation mandates with the resources available. Specifically, Tennessee has contracted with the JTPA to serve exactly 7 percent of the cases required to participate. Texas has devoted a large share of its JOBS funds to low-cost job search and placement services to the most job-ready clients. The other large expenditure in Texas is for case managers who are to access resources from other programs to serve JOBS clients. Mississippi has also devoted a large share of its resources to case management, for the similar purpose of referring clients to other programs.

Oregon's experience with welfare employment programs differs from the other states' and places it in a third category. As a result of efforts by welfare advocates, the

state introduced in 1988 a pilot program that emphasized a self-sufficiency strategy through education, employment, and training services and that included many of the federal JOBS requirements. To gain experience with its newly introduced pilot program, the state delayed JOBS implementation until October 1990. Oregon has designed more detailed program models than the other states and, unlike them, does not have a purely assessment-based design for all participants. It is also the only state that planned to spend more than the maximum amount eligible for federal matching in the initial period of program implementation.

In general, the JOBS legislation has encouraged a moderate shift to a more human investment approach. States are placing less emphasis on immediate job placement and more on services that will increase the capacity of recipients to achieve self-sufficiency over the long term. This shift is reflected primarily in the expansion of educational components and, to a more limited degree, in the expenditures on case management services.

Strategies Underlying the States' Design Choices

Although the JOBS programs of the study states are diverse, there a number of similarities in their design. The range of services that can be provided to participants is quite uniform across the states. In addition to the mandated services, all states offer job search and on-the-job training. Nine of the states offer case management services and Oklahoma, which does not formally provide case management, organizes its staff to deliver case management services. All of the states operate assessment-based programs for most of their caseload, and few refer participants to job search prior to an assessment or specify the sequence of other initial activities. Most states plan to rely heavily on the enrollment of volunteers to meet their participation goals.

However, the motivations for these design choices vary among the states. In many states, choices were based on a belief that a particular approach is best for clients. For example, state administrators argued that a voluntary program helps people who want to be helped, permits mothers to stay home with their children if they prefer, and encourages service providers to offer services that people want. Assessment-based programs are favored because they permit services to be tailored to the needs and preferences of the participant. A wide range of available services increases the likelihood that clients will receive those that they need, based on their assessments. Case management can insure that clients are linked to needed services and that supportive counseling is provided.

But in other states, these design choices were a strategic response to a scarcity of resources. As indicated most clearly in Tennessee, reliance on motivated volunteers is a type of creaming designed to meet the federal mandates with extremely limited expenditures. In both Mississippi and Texas, the decision to allocate a large share of their funds to case management is consistent with their minimal funding of education, training, and employment services. Case managers are expected to access the services of other organizations without paying for them. Additionally, in these three states and others, assessment-based programs are one method for coping with uncertainty about the types and availability of service components. When service availability is limited, an assessment-based approach permits case managers to refer clients to those services that are available, which may not be those that the assessment indicates are most needed. In fact, the assessment itself may become skewed on the basis of available services (see Austin, 1981). Unlike programs with a prescribed sequence of services, no specific services are guaranteed in these assessment-based programs.

Interagency Partnerships

From the perspective of the states, the federal legislation encouraged or reinforced the development of interagency coordination. Within each state, JOBS implementation is a joint effort of many organizations, especially the state agencies administering the JTPA and educational programs. As a result of these linkages, state welfare agencies are drawing upon the expertise of other agencies to build the capacity to deliver JOBS services and child care.

The linkages between the state welfare agency and other state agencies providing JOBS services take several forms. In three of the early implementing states, Maryland, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, the state welfare agency was already a partner in a broad education and training effort directed at low-skilled people. To implement JOBS, the state welfare agency built on these linkages by transferring both funds and considerable management responsibility for JOBS to the state agency administering the JTPA. JOBS funds are used by these agencies and their contractors to purchase services for JOBS participants, thereby assuring them a certain level of service. To some extent, these other agencies also use their own resources to serve JOBS clients.

In Michigan, New York, and Oregon, the partnerships are more varied and link the state welfare agency to local organizations as well as other state agencies. As in Maryland, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, considerable amounts of JOBS funds are used to purchase services for JOBS participants. Similarly, some of these other agencies use their resources to serve JOBS clients.

In contrast, the other four states' welfare agencies do not purchase significant amounts of services from other organizations. Where linkages have been established, they are for the purpose of obtaining resources for JOBS participants. In Tennessee, most of the resources for JOBS services other than child care are provided by the JTPA. In Mississippi and Oklahoma, the state welfare agency has negotiated agreements with many organizations to provide services to JOBS clients without payment. In Texas, only small amounts are being used to purchase services and few firm agreements have been reached with other organizations to provide services to JOBS clients without payment.

The agreements in Tennessee and Oklahoma may be successful in assuring welfare recipients access to services. In Tennessee, services for 2,023 participants, the number required to meet the 7 percent participation rate, must be provided under the terms of a contract. In Oklahoma, the state welfare agency is a politically powerful institution and had considerable experience with welfare employment programs before JOBS implementation. But in Mississippi and Texas, few binding commitments have been made by other agencies to serve JOBS clients. In the absence of large amounts of JOBS funds to purchase services, their capacity to serve clients is in doubt.

The reliance by the states on the services of other organizations was encouraged by the federal legislation's emphasis on interagency coordination. This coordination allows the state welfare agencies to access services already available in local communities and potentially avoids service duplication. Reliance on coordination, however, also decreases the welfare agency's ability to control the nature and scope of the services provided, particularly when these services are obtained without payment. Even when services are purchased, issues of control and accountability arise. These issues are compounded further by the autonomy of regional and local welfare districts in some states.

The Challenges of Implementing JOBS

When this study was conducted, in October through December 1990, all study states planned to meet the 7 percent participation rate and to spend 55 percent of their funds on members of the target groups. For seven of the states—Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania—meeting these federal mandates was not thought to present a major challenge. Programs introduced during the 1980s and expanded with the enactment of JOBS were serving relatively large numbers of recipients. According to state projections, the number of participants was sufficient to meet or exceed the 7 percent threshold. Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas also planned to meet the participation rate, but administrators were less certain that this goal would be achieved. With large numbers of recipients in the target groups, most states expected to face little difficulty in spending 55 percent of their JOBS funds on target group members.

While many state administrators expected that their JOBS programs would meet the federal mandates for participation and targeting, they were not confident about their ability to track and monitor program participation or to meet the federal reporting requirements for JOBS. That some states viewed these provisions as a major challenge, perhaps the greatest challenge, in implementing JOBS indicates the ease with which they were able to transform their existing programs into JOBS. Obtaining the information to learn whether the state was meeting the federal mandates was perceived as a challenge that was as great, or even greater than, meeting the mandates themselves.

The 20-hour rule, which requires that participants be scheduled for JOBS activities for an average of 20 hours each week, has also been a challenge for most states. For states that had developed their welfare-to-work programs prior to JOBS, when hours of participation was not a critical parameter, adjustments in program design were necessary. For states developing new programs, efforts were made to incorporate the 20-hour rule into the design of components.

The purpose of the 20-hour rule is to ensure that JOBS services are meaningful and, by monitoring such activity, to encourage clients' continuous participation. States are clearly responding to the rule by establishing JOBS activities, or by linking several JOBS activities, to provide 20 hours of service. Many are finding this to be a challenge, which indicates that services were not scheduled for 20 hours prior to JOBS and that JOBS is encouraging change. The rule is operating as intended to insure that participation in education, training, and employment activities requires a significant effort on the part of both the agency and the participant.

The rule is also having some negative consequences. It potentially discourages states from enrolling participants in full-time college programs, which consider full-time enrollment to be 12 to 15 hours each week. To schedule additional hours may lead to the creation of meaningless activities for these students or undermine their ability to successfully pursue their studies. The rule also creates no incentive to work with clients who may be more limited in their current capacity and are simply unable to handle 20 hours of approved JOBS activities. The 20-hour rule also fails to take into account the need to pace activities based on the abilities of the client. For example, a person participating in a substance abuse program and taking several hours of course work to obtain a GED certificate may be proceeding appropriately, and scheduling additional hours may overwhelm the individual during these initial steps to economic self-sufficiency.

Meeting the Spirit of the Law

When the Family Support Act was passed in 1988, many advocates viewed the JOBS title not only as programmatic legislation, but as a signal for change. As a programmatic reform, it gives states new opportunities to help the dependent poor achieve self-sufficiency. In providing additional federal financial support and mandating a minimum participation rate as a condition of receiving this support, the Act gives the states incentives to take advantage of these opportunities.

But the spirit of the legislation goes beyond these legislative provisions. Its advocates intended JOBS to be a signal to welfare systems throughout the nation that they should take on a mission that emphasizes services intended to reduce welfare dependency rather than just to provide cash assistance. Moreover, government and recipients should enter into a new social contract that would redefine their relationship as one of mutual obligation. In doing so, government would fulfill its obligation to provide the services that people need to become self-sufficient. Welfare recipients, in turn, would be encouraged to fulfill their obligation to make efforts on their own behalf to prepare for jobs and enter the labor force (Reischauer, 1987). Some also envisioned the Family Support Act as offering the potential to serve vulnerable parents and their children through more extensive supportive services and linkages to comprehensive family and children's services (Smith, Blank, & Bond, 1990).

We conclude from our review of the initial phase of JOBS implementation that states have come closer to meeting the letter of the law than the spirit of the law. For the most part, the hope that states would use JOBS implementation as an opportunity to signal a change in the mission of welfare systems or to redefine the social contract has not been realized. In none of the study states did JOBS spur state leaders to alter their public stance toward welfare or to make a strong personal commitment to reform their welfare programs in light of the new law. The creative and enthusiastic response of Massachusetts and several other states to the optional WIN Demonstration and Title IV-A work programs was not replicated by the implementation of JOBS in the 10 states examined here.

Nor has the theme of mutual obligation been prominent in the rhetoric of state leaders or reflected in their policies. If the strength of the obligation undertaken by government to provide opportunities for welfare recipients is measured by funding levels for JOBS, only Maryland and Oregon have come close to assuming their full obligation. If the strength of the obligation placed on welfare recipients is measured by the extent to which they are required to participate in JOBS, states are at most imposing this obligation selectively, if at all. Looking across the 10 states, we see some evidence that states impose more obligations on recipients when they devote more funds to the program. States that are spending the least per participant rely heavily on voluntary enrollment, while those spending the most place greater emphasis on mandatory participation.

Whether states will increase their commitment to the program as the mandated participation rate rises or whether funding will remain constant or even decline is the most significant issue now facing the states. The current economic recession has dampened state tax revenues while increasing welfare caseloads, limiting the states' ability to draw down their entitlement of federal funds for JOBS. This may prevent states from offering the same level of services in all parts of the state or, in the three states that implemented JOBS in a limited number of counties, from implementing the program statewide. If funding remains stable or declines in the face of the increasing mandated participation rate, states may be forced to reconsider the design of their JOBS programs.

The Promise of JOBS

Although the promise of JOBS has yet to be realized, the opportunity remains. While we have concerns about the unfolding of JOBS programs based on the initial responses of these ten states, we also find that JOBS has sustained and fostered the commitment of state welfare agencies to provide enhanced educational and training opportunities to welfare recipients. The JOBS legislation and its associated provisions for child care are demanding and complex. To implement this legislation and to realize its potential require extensive and complicated responses by state and local governments. We must allow sufficient time for state and local governments to experiment with and to develop the JOBS programs appropriate to their social and economic situations as well as to the needs of their clients. At this stage of implementation, meeting the letter of the law may be necessary to allow the unfolding of the spirit of the law.

References

Austin, C. D. (1981) Client assessment in context. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 17, 4–12.

Lurie, I., & Sanger, M. B. (1991). The Family Support Act: Defining the social contract in New York. *Social Service Review*, 65(1), 43–67.

Moynihan, D. P. (1990, November 25). The children of the state. *The Washington Post*, C1.

Nathan, R. P. (1982). The methodology for field network evaluation studies. In W. Williams (Ed.), *Studying implementation: Methodological and administrative issues* (pp. 73–99). Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House.

Reischauer, R. D. (1987, Summer). Welfare reform: Will consensus be enough? *The Brookings Review*, pp. 3–8.

Rovner, J. (1988, October 8). Congress approves overhaul of welfare system. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, 2825–2831.

Smith, S., Blank, S., & Bond, J. T. (1990). *One program, two generations.* New York: The Foundation for Child Development in partnership with the National Center for Children in Poverty.

INTRODUCTION

The passage of the Family Support Act of 1988 was accompanied by high expectations for the transformation of the nation's welfare system. Hailed as a new consensus on welfare reform and as the most sweeping reform of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program in the past 50 years (Rovner, 1988b), this landmark legislation was also viewed as a new social contract between government and welfare recipients (Moynihan, 1990). Under this new social contract, government has an obligation to meet the needs of poor families for income and services that may enable them to become economically self-sufficient. Recipients of welfare, in turn, have an obligation to make reasonable efforts on their own behalf to achieve self-sufficiency. Some also viewed the legislation as an opportunity to create a preventive, two-generational program serving vulnerable and at-risk children in AFDC families (Smith, Blank, & Bond, 1990).

The Family Support Act seeks to strengthen the economic self-sufficiency of AFDC recipients through increased enforcement of child support obligations and a new welfare employment program for the provision of education, training, and employment services. This new welfare employment program, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS), replaces the Work Incentive (WIN) Program and is a major vehicle by which the Act seeks to increase the economic self-sufficiency of AFDC recipients.

JOBS is designed "to assure that needy families with children obtain the education, training, and employment that will help them avoid long-term welfare dependence" (42 USC 681 (a)). It builds on previous legislation related to welfare employment programs, including the Work Incentive Program and organizational arrangements and program activities that were permitted under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 and subsequent amendments. In designing this new welfare employment program, the drafters also drew on information regarding the states' optional welfare-to-work programs introduced in the 1980s (e.g., GAO, 1987, 1988; Nightingale & Burbridge, 1987; and Gueron, 1987), as well as on information regarding the dynamics of poverty and characteristics of the AFDC caseload (e.g., Bane & Ellwood, 1983).

Primary responsibility for JOBS rests with each state's welfare agency, which was allowed to implement JOBS in July 1989, and required to do so by October 1990. States must offer educational activities including high school or equivalent education, basic and remedial education, and English proficiency education; job skills training; job readiness activities; and job development and job placement.

Additionally, states must provide at least two of the following: group and individual job search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, and community work experience.

Subject to the availability of resources, all non-exempt AFDC recipients are required to participate in JOBS. States must guarantee child care if it is necessary for a recipient to participate in the JOBS program. Federal funding for child care is open-ended and matched at the Medicaid rate, which ranges from 50 to 80 percent. In a significant departure from previous legislation, mothers with children age three or older are required to participate if child care is available. At state option, participation in JOBS may be required of parents with children age one or older. Mothers under 20 years of age who have not completed high school or its equivalent are required to participate in educational activities, regardless of their children's ages.

To encourage states to focus on people who are most likely to become long-term welfare recipients, the federal legislation requires that 55 percent of the JOBS funds be spent on specific categories of recipients who are, or are likely to become, long-term welfare recipients. The legislation has also mandated overall participation rates for states' JOBS programs: 7 percent of the non-exempt caseload must participate in 1990; 20 percent in 1995.

To assist states in financing their JOBS programs, federal matching funds have been increased significantly. The limitations on the total amount of federal grants to the states are raised considerably from previous levels of funding; available federal funding in 1990 was $800 million and increases to $1.3 billion in 1995. The federal matching rate is 90 percent up to each state's WIN allocation for 1987. Expenditures for JOBS services beyond that amount are matched at the Medicaid rate or 60 percent, whichever is higher. Supportive services and administrative expenses are matched at 50 percent.

JOBS is an ambitious piece of legislation that some of its framers considered an agent for institutional change — a signal from Congress to welfare systems throughout the nation that they should take on a mission and character that more heavily emphasizes services intended to reduce welfare dependency. In their minds, the 1988 act aims to convert what in the past have often been predominately cash assistance programs into employment and training service systems to prepare AFDC recipients for jobs and facilitate their entry into the labor force (Rovner, 1988a). Passage of the JOBS legislation and the associated child care provisions represented a major congressional accomplishment, but the passage of the federal legislation was only the initial step. How have state and local governments responded to the challenges and opportunities afforded by JOBS?

Implementing the JOBS program presents a major challenge to state and local governments. Welfare agencies are required to perform the complicated task of providing cash assistance and delivering or coordinating a wide range of services: individual needs assessment, job readiness activities, job development and placement, education, training, and support services. Making the necessary alterations in their program designs, administrative structures, management activities, and attitudes are a necessary prerequisite to fulfilling the legislation's purpose. Will the JOBS requirements penetrate the operations of welfare agencies, and will agencies have the capacity to implement the ambitious purposes of this legislation?

Recognizing the importance of studying the process of implementing JOBS, researchers based at the Rockefeller Institute of Government in Albany — the public policy research arm of the State University of New York — are conducting a 10-state implementation study of the JOBS program extending over three years. In analyzing the implementation of the new federal legislation, we seek to understand the complex chain of events between changes in federal laws and regulations and changes in the opportunities available for recipients. Whether or not JOBS succeeds in reducing welfare dependency will depend, in part, on the design and administration of the education, employment, training, and supportive services offered by state and local governments.

This study assesses the implementation of JOBS by focusing on two areas: the way states have altered their employment and training programs in response to the Family Support Act and the extent to which local welfare agencies have realized the objectives of the JOBS legislation. To assess the state and local responses to JOBS, three rounds of research will be undertaken. The first round focused on the implementation of JOBS at the state level — states' choices, program designs, and issues in implementing the legislation. This state-level information provides the background and context for analyzing the implementation of JOBS at the local level.

The second round of research focuses on JOBS implementation at the local level—the organizational structure, the mechanisms for delivering services, and the resulting opportunities for recipients. The third round will assess the changes made as the states and local agencies gain experience with the JOBS program and come under increasing pressure from the federal mandates to serve more AFDC recipients in their JOBS programs.

The first round of research was scheduled to begin as soon as all states in the sample had implemented the program. The Family Support Act permitted states to implement JOBS in July 1989, but they were not required to do so until October 1990. For this reason, the field research began in October 1990 and examined the status of JOBS from October through December 1990. The second round of research is examining the status of JOBS at the local level during June through August 1991, and the third round will be performed one year later, June through August 1992.

This report, the first in a series of reports on JOBS implementation, presents the findings from the first round of research. The purpose of this report is to provide initial information about the program designs, policies, and strategies adopted by the state-level organizations in their response to the federal JOBS legislation. The findings are based on structured reports submitted by policy analysts for each of the 10 states. These reports reflect state policies as well as the intentions and perspectives of state-level officials and administrators. Given this focus, this first report is not an assessment of the nature or extent of JOBS services provided to AFDC recipients; this would require research at the local level, which is the next step in the study. While the scope of the report has this limitation, we believe it contains timely information of interest to those concerned with JOBS implementation.

Research Methods

The primary research method for data collection during this phase of the study was field network research (Nathan, 1982). Field network research is a method for policy research developed and used to assess revenue sharing, community development block grants, public service employment under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and the Reagan domestic program. The essential

feature of this approach is a network of indigenous field researchers familiar with the programs and political structure and processes of each sample jurisdiction. These field researchers assess the program in their jurisdiction by using a uniform instrument for collecting and analyzing information. The research framework, analytic questions, and data requirements are developed by the central staff of the project. After the field researchers have completed their analysis, the central staff uses the findings from the field to describe and explain inter-jurisdictional variations, confirm or reject hypotheses, and reach conclusions about program implementation.

For this study, the data collection instrument, or reporting format, was developed by the central staff in conjunction with the field associates. (Brief biographical sketches of the field associates may be found in Appendix A.) The instrument consists of open-ended questions and requests narrative statements, quantitative data, and supporting documents. (A copy of the reporting format is included in Appendix B.)

Field researchers gathered the required information in a variety of ways, including on-site observations, interviews with state officials and program staff, and reviews of program materials and reports. In this round, the field network research examined the status of JOBS between October and December, 1990. Following data collection, the field associates wrote their reports organized according to the reporting format and submitted them to the central staff for analysis across the 10 states.

TABLE 1: Criteria for Selecting States

	Implementation Date	Income Rank	Poverty Rate (percent)	Fiscal Stress
State Administered				
Michigan	7/89	17	14.4	S
Mississippi	10/90	50	25.6	S
Oklahoma	7/89	37	15.5	–
Oregon	10/90	31	12.6	–
Pennsylvania	10/89	21	12.4	S
Tennessee	10/90	38	17.8	S
Texas	10/90	26	16.2	–
State Supervised				
Maryland	7/89	7	8.5	–
Minnesota	7/89	15	11.5	S
New York	10/90	5	15.2	D

Sources:

Rank of per capita personal income and poverty rate: National Conference of State Legislatures, State-Local Fiscal Indicators, January 1990, p.86.

Fiscal Stress: Ronald Snell, "The State Fiscal Outlook: 1990 and the Coming Decade," State Legislative Report, Vol. 15, No. 5 (Denver, Colorado: National Conference of State Legislatures, February 1990).

D=Expected deficit in FY1990; S=Possible revenue shortfall in FY 1990.

Selection of States

A major decision in conducting this three-year implementation study was the selection of 10 study states. The states in the study are Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas. In choosing the 10 states, an effort was made to select states that would illustrate a range of state experiences in implementing JOBS. Several characteristics of states were identified, and states were chosen to provide diversity according to these characteristics. Economic and fiscal variables are shown in Table 1 and include the poverty rate and the rank by per capita income for the states. To reflect the ability of states to finance welfare expenditures, consideration was given to the level of fiscal stress expected in 1990.

Another criterion was whether the state had introduced a new welfare employment program prior to JOBS that enabled it to meet many of the requirements for JOBS without major restructuring, or whether the state needed to design and implement a new program. Information from a variety of sources as well as the states' expected implementation dates were used to select states with variations in program development. Another factor that may influence the course of JOBS implementation is whether public assistance is administered by the state government or by local government under state supervision. To reflect the national pattern in which two-thirds of the states administer public assistance, seven state-administered programs were chosen for the sample. Consideration was also given to regional balance.

The final variable considered was the state's inclusion in the JOBS Evaluation Study being conducted by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC). Their evaluation, mandated by the Family Support Act, will estimate the impact of JOBS services in selected sites using an experimental design. One purpose of the Rockefeller Institute study is to provide a context in which to view the programs evaluated by MDRC. To facilitate comparisons between the two studies, an effort was made to ensure that some of the states in this sample contained JOBS Evaluation sites selected by MDRC.

This study focuses exclusively on JOBS and the AFDC programs administered or supervised by state governments. Provisions related to the AFDC-Unemployed Parent program and to JOBS programs being operated by tribal entities have been excluded in order to keep data collection and the analysis of JOBS implementation manageable. In this round of research, we also excluded the provisions related to transitional child care. This area will be considered in our third round of research.

Organization of This Report

The remainder of this report consists of nine sections. Section II provides an overview of the states included in the study. Findings are presented in sections III through IX. The findings are organized around major provisions of the legislation, and each section begins with a brief statement of the study's main questions in that area and the study's findings. In section III, findings are presented on the states' administrative and legislative response to the federal legislation, including the funding for the states' JOBS programs. Section IV provides an in-depth look at the program designs selected by the states for JOBS and the allocation of resources within the programs. The states' use of contracting and their responses to the specific legislative provisions calling for coordination with the Job Training Partnership Act agencies and educational providers are presented in section V. Section VI discusses the states' experiences with child care and other supportive services.

Section VII covers the states' choices for client processing, including the initial assessments, employability plans, and case management services. The states' responses to the federal reporting requirements and their management information systems are discussed in section VIII. Findings related to the federal mandates for participation rates and the targeting of expenditures, and the states' choices for prioritizing clients for JOBS services are presented in section IX. The final section provides concluding comments, identifies pressing implementation issues facing the states, and outlines the next steps in this study on JOBS implementation.

II

OVERVIEW OF THE STATES' JOBS PROGRAMS

As an orientation to the states in the study, this section provides a brief overview of the states' AFDC programs and some of their choices regarding the JOBS programs. More detailed and individualized descriptions of the states' JOBS programs are provided in the state profiles at the end of this chapter.

The states in this study are reflective of the national pattern in which two-thirds of the states administer public assistance. The state-administered systems are Michigan, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas. The state supervised, county administered systems are Maryland, Minnesota, and New York. The locus of administrative responsibility, however, does not necessarily reflect the degree to which counties retain autonomy and discretion in administering local welfare employment programs. Although counties in Minnesota and New York have traditionally retained high levels of autonomy and continue to do so under JOBS, counties in Michigan and regional units in Texas also have high levels of local discretion, and in Oregon a higher level of local discretion is being developed. In contrast, a high degree of state direction is exerted in Maryland, a state supervised system.

As in the nation as a whole, the level of the states' monthly welfare benefits vary widely. As shown in Table 2, the study states had established standards of need for three-person families ranging from $368 in Mississippi to $614 in Pennsylvania, as of January 1990. Across the states, the maximum benefits allowed under AFDC for a three-person family range from $120 in Mississippi to $577 in New York. In three states (Minnesota, New York, and Oregon), the maximum benefit allowed under AFDC meets the state's standard of need.

The monthly caseload size varies tremendously across the states included in this study, ranging from 32,505 cases in Oregon to 343,785 in New York. Under the Family Support Act, four states in this study — Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas — were required to implement the Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Unemployed Parent program (AFDC-UP). The other states already operated this program for two-parent families.

Nine of the states included in this study operated WIN Demonstration programs prior to the introduction of JOBS. In six of these states, these programs were statewide in their coverage. The other four states operated WIN or WIN Demonstration programs on a more limited geographic basis. Many of the states also chose to offer some or all of the optional work programs such as community

work experience (CWEP) and job search that have been permitted under Title IV-A since the early 1980s. (More detail on the states' programs prior to JOBS is presented in section IV.)

Five states — Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania— may be characterized as "early implementors" of the JOBS legislation: they began their programs in July 1989 or shortly thereafter (see Table 3). Along with New York, these states may also be characterized as having well developed welfare employment programs prior to JOBS. Each of these states has a rich history surrounding its entry into welfare-to-work programs, often enlivened by extensive public debate and bold state legislative or administrative initiatives during the 1980s. In some states, such as Minnesota, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, these initiatives involved the forging of new partnerships with other agencies, such as the JTPA and the state education agencies.

Mississippi, New York, Oregon, Tennessee, and Texas implemented JOBS in October 1990, the date required by the federal legislation. Although New York may be considered to have had extensive experience with welfare employment programs, the federal JOBS legislation required the enactment of state enabling legislation, which led to extensive debate about the state's choices for JOBS and to a delay in the state's implementation of JOBS. In contrast, the state welfare agency in Oregon chose to delay implementation of JOBS in order to gain experience in its own recent efforts at welfare reform. Implementation occurred statewide in most states but on a more limited geographic basis in Mississippi, Oregon, and Texas.

TABLE 2: Monthly AFDC Payments and Caseloads

State	Need Standard for 3-person Family, January 1990[1]	Maximum Benefit for 3-person Family, January 1990[1]	Average Payment per Family, FFY 1990[2]	Number of Cases September 1990[2]	
				AFDC	AFDC-UP
Maryland	$548	$396	$367	69,234	567
Michigan	575	516	464	195,633	23,991
Minnesota	532	532	495	51,498	6,977
Mississippi	368	120	121	60,486	0
New York	577	577	521	343,785	9,670
Oklahoma	471	325	284	39,916	0
Oregon	432	432	386	32,505	1,140 *
Pennsylvania	614	421	373	176,305	7,197
Tennessee	387	184	183	80,396	0
Texas	574	184	167	219,388	0

* Monthly average in fiscal year 1990

Sources:

1 *1991 Green Book*, Overview of Entitlement Programs, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, May 7, 1991, pp.602-605.

2 "Quarterly Report of State-Reported Data on Aid to Families with Dependent Children," Office of Family Assistance, Department of Health and Human Services, January 1991.

State Choices for JOBS

The federal legislation allows states to make a range of choices in constructing their JOBS programs. These choices, and how they are being implemented, are the core of this report. Here we provide a brief overview of selected major policy choices.

Seven of the states chose to exempt adult AFDC recipients with children under the age of three years (see Table 3). In Maryland, the exemption applies to those with children under the age of two years; in Michigan and Oklahoma, to those with children under the age of one year. In Michigan, the welfare employment programs preceding JOBS had similar requirements for the age of the child exemption. In Oklahoma, the preceding WIN Demonstration program had a 1115 waiver for the age of the child exemption. In other words, the age of the child was not an exemption from program participation in Oklahoma.

In addition to all the required services under the Family Support Act, all states also offer job search and on-the-job training. Three of the states have chosen to offer all of the elective services, which include job search and on-the-job training as well as work supplementation and CWEP. With the exceptions of Michigan and Oregon, the states are offering post-secondary education within their JOBS programs. In Maryland, New York, and Texas, post-secondary education is limited to two years. In Michigan and Oregon, post-secondary education is not offered as an optional JOBS component, but it may be approved as a self-initiated educational

TABLE 3: JOBS Implementation in the Ten States

State	Implementation Date	Program Name	Geographic Scope	Age of Child Exemption	Case Management
Maryland	7/89	Project Independence	Statewide	2 and under	All JOBS clients (different levels of intensity
Michigan	7/89	MOST	Statewide	1 and under	All JOBS clients
Minnesota	7/89	Project STRIDE	Statewide	3 and under	Restricted availability
Mississippi	10/90	JOBS	9 of 84 counties	3 and under	All JOBS clients
New York	10/90	JOBS	Statewide	3 and under	Restricted availability
Oklahoma	7/89	Education, Training, and Employment	Statewide	1 and under	No
Oregon	10/90	JOBS	16 of 36 counties	3 and under	All JOBS clients
Pennsylvania	10/89	New Directions For Employment	Statewide	3 and under	All JOBS clients (different levels of intensity)
Tennessee	10/90	JOBS	Statewide	3 and under	Piloting several models
Texas	10/90	WINGS	82 of 254 counties	3 and under	Restricted availability

Percent of AFDC cases in the state residing in JOBS counties:
Mississippi – 29 percent
Texas – 90 percent
Oregon – 65 percent

activity. All states except Oklahoma elected to offer case management services under the JOBS program. These services are available to all JOBS participants in five of the states and on a more restricted basis in the other five (see Table 7 in section IV for additional detail).

The States' Programs

As an introduction to the diversity found in the states' JOBS programs, we have provided selected highlights from each state that, to us, stand out as particularly central in that state's experiences with welfare employment programs and with the implementation of JOBS. Refer to the state profiles at the end of this chapter for more detailed overviews of each state.

Maryland's Project Independence. With strong gubernatorial leadership, Maryland launched a major welfare reform initiative just prior to the passage of the Family Support Act. With minor modifications, that program became the state's JOBS program, which is the joint responsibility of the state's IV-A agency and the Department of Economic and Employment Development. Under JOBS, the JTPA continues as the lead organization for service delivery on the local level. The state drew down three-quarters of its federal allotment of JOBS funds in its first year of operations and 69 percent in state fiscal year 1991.

Michigan's Opportunity and Skills Training Program (MOST). Enacted in 1984 but based on a prior history with welfare employment programs, MOST required little program development to meet the federal JOBS requirements, and some regard it as a model for the federal JOBS legislation itself. At the time of the study, Michigan was facing a serious budget deficit and had just elected a new governor.

Minnesota's Project STRIDE. A state with a rich legislative history in welfare reform and education initiatives, Minnesota has traditionally placed a strong emphasis on education as an important vehicle to economic self-sufficiency and has recognized the need to individualize services. The only state without formalized linkages of any sort to education services, it has one of the higher levels of educational enrollments for JOBS participants. It is also the only state to have experienced the need to restrict access to the JOBS program because of insufficient child care funds.

Mississippi's JOBS. Prior to JOBS, Mississippi had only very limited experience with welfare employment programs. In responding to the federal legislation, the state chose to bypass its earlier WIN program and to contract with local community action agencies for the administration of JOBS. Child care has become the responsibility of child care management agencies that operate under contract to the state IV-A agency. The state has allocated very limited funds for JOBS services and the state expects to obtain most education, training, and employment services from other programs without payment.

New York's JOBS. New York is the only state in this study that experienced extensive legislative debate in conjunction with the implementation of JOBS. The debate itself focused on the relative emphasis to be given to providing opportunities to clients versus imposing obligations on them. Out of that debate came one of the unique features of New York's program: if a parent requests assistance in finding child care, the parent must be offered at least two choices of regulated providers. If regulated care is unavailable or inaccessible, the parent may be excused from JOBS participation. The legislation also placed greater restrictions on the

counties' discretion by mandating that all program components be included in a county's program.

Oklahoma's Education, Training and Employment Program (ET&E). Oklahoma's early welfare-to-work programs placed heavy emphasis on moving recipients directly into employment. An unusual feature of those early efforts was to require participation by recipients with infants and preschool children. JOBS was implemented with only minor modifications, and a participation rate of 29 percent was achieved in 1990. For Oklahoma, the JOBS legislation has meant a greater emphasis on education in its welfare employment program. Most services are obtained without payment of JOBS funds through a large number of interagency agreements.

Oregon's JOBS. Oregon's efforts at welfare reform reflect experimentation with two models of welfare employment programs. First, the state operated a program emphasizing labor force attachment and recipient obligations, characterized by some as harsh and punitive, but effective in achieving reduced welfare rolls. In response to criticism about that program, the state developed a program emphasizing a human investment strategy, which was implemented on a pilot basis in 1988. This program served as the base for Oregon's JOBS program. Unlike any other state in the study, Oregon operates a fixed sequence of services for those assessed as not job-ready. Oregon relies heavily on the purchase of services for its JOBS program, and its expenditures for JOBS relative to the size of its caseload are expected to be higher than any other state in the study. It plans to draw down its full federal entitlement and has authorized appropriations for $6.5 million of additional state funding for the program.

Pennsylvania's New Directions for Employment. Pennsylvania's early efforts with welfare reform also focused on a labor force attachment strategy, but in 1987 the state introduced, under a new governor, a program very similar to JOBS, which emphasized high intensity services: the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) program. SPOC is a joint effort of three state agencies — welfare, labor, and education — and it operates through the JTPA Service Delivery Areas. Although SPOC reflects the operating core of the state's JOBS implementation effort and serves as a primary vehicle for meeting the federally mandated rates of participation, it is only one track of the state's program. The other track is the New Directions program, which follows a similar program design, but is not funded at the same level. For this track, resources for education, training, and employment services must be obtained from other programs without payment.

Tennessee's JOBS. Tennessee's experience with welfare employment programs has been modest, but in 1988, the Department of Labor agreed to provide employment and training services to AFDC recipients using earmarked JTPA funds. In implementing JOBS, the state did not allocate any funds for education, training, or employment services; rather it reallocated JTPA funds to pay for many of the needed services. As a result, the JTPA has become the main provider of employment and training services. The JTPA has also assumed the responsibility for delivering or arranging all other JOBS and supportive services. Tennessee is the only state in the study to have an official policy of limiting enrollment in JOBS to volunteers.

Texas's Winning Independence Gaining Success (WINGS). Just prior to the passage of the Family Support Act, Texas began a welfare employment program that placed greater emphasis on a human investment strategy than its earlier, lim-

ited efforts. Its approach, which has been incorporated into JOBS, was one of triage — tracking clients into three service levels. For those who are most job-ready, job search and placement services are being purchased through competitive contracts with various organizations. At this point, Texas is the only state in the study with services being provided by a private, for-profit organization. For the other service tracks, services are being obtained from other agencies without payment, with the JTPA playing a central role. Because the state legislature limited appropriations to those programs and services mandated by the Family Support Act, few funds were appropriated for education, training, and employment services. However, the legislature did allocate $1 million to the Texas Education Agency specifically for adult education for JOBS participants.

In the remainder of this report, we expand on these choices made by the states in implementing JOBS as well as other choices, such as the administration of and payment mechanisms for child care, the use of assessments and employability plans, coordination between agencies, and the federal mandates for targeting and participation rates. We begin, however, at a somewhat broader level with the findings related to the states' legislative and administrative responses to the federal JOBS legislation.

MARYLAND: PROJECT INDEPENDENCE

Maryland launched a well-publicized employment and training program for AFDC recipients just prior to passage of the Family Support Act. Through strong gubernatorial leadership, primary responsibility for operating the WIN Demonstration program at the local level was transferred from the welfare agencies to the Service Delivery Areas of the JTPA. Additional state funds were appropriated for the program, more than were required to match the federal WIN funds. At the local level, officials were given the flexibility to offer recipients a wide variety of services to promote self-sufficiency. Client participation was voluntary and publicity about the program was upbeat, stressing training and job opportunities.

Building on this approach, the Family Support Act did not demand major program development, and implementation was accomplished by administrative regulations in July 1989. The program, Project Independence, was altered as needed to meet the new federal requirements. The JTPA continues to be the lead organization for delivering employment and training services at the local level.

Responsibility for JOBS in Maryland is divided between the Department of Human Resources (DHR) and the Department of Economic and Employment Development (DEED). The welfare agency (DHR) provides the JOBS orientation and conducts the initial assessment. It then refers recipients to the JTPA or, if education is needed, directly to education providers. DHR also arranges child care and other supportive services and administers the process of conciliation and sanctioning. The DEED, operating through JTPA Service Delivery Areas, has full responsibility for administering Project Independence's employment and training activities. This includes not only delivering services, but also ensuring that each Service Delivery Area meets the federal mandates for participation and targeting.

Although in Maryland the counties administer public assistance, the governor has been able to exert considerable leverage over the design of JOBS and its operation at the local level. During the initial phase of JOBS implementation, primary responsibility for policy-making and planning rested with the Governor's Employment and Training Council. The Council supervises the Project Independence Management Team, which oversees program operations. Membership in these groups includes not only administrators of DHR and DEED, but also representatives of other state and local agencies, the private sector, the legislature, unions, and local Service Delivery Areas. Bringing these groups together under his direction has enabled the governor to achieve an unusual degree of interagency coordination. However, some observers argue that this has been accompanied by a loss of administrative authority on the part of the welfare agency.

Project Independence has an assessment-based design, in the sense that it emphasizes no particular service or sequence of services. Various types of case management are encouraged by the state, including case management teams composed of a welfare caseworker, a JTPA counselor and an educational staff member when appropriate. JOBS is a mandatory program, but volunteers are given preference. Parents with children under age two are exempt from participation.

For the most part, the training and employment services offered under JOBS are the same as those that were available under the previous initiative. Maryland no longer provides work supplementation and mandatory CWEP, although it does permit voluntary work experience. JOBS appears to have increased the availability of educational services, although there are no formal contracts at the state level for education services and these agreements must be worked out at the local level. It is less clear that more employment and training services have become available as a result of JOBS implementation.

State officials expect that Maryland will meet the federal mandates concerning participation and targeting of expenditures in 1991 and 1992. A service delivery system was in place prior to JOBS and significant amounts of new funds have been spent for JOBS: the state drew down almost all of its federal allotment of JOBS funds in its first year of operations, and 76 percent in state fiscal year 1991. However, officials are not certain whether and how the state will adjust its program to meet the rising participation rates over the longer term.

MICHIGAN:

MICHIGAN OPPORTUNITY AND SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM (MOST)

In Michigan, JOBS implementation is another step in the gradual evolution of employment and training programs for welfare recipients. Drawing on prior experience, Michigan quickly opted for the WIN Demonstration program in 1982 and in 1984 enacted the Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training (MOST) Program. MOST is a refinement of previous efforts to design a single program for all employable AFDC, general assistance, and Food Stamp recipients in the state and offers a wide variety of education, training and employment services. With MOST in place, the Family Support Act required little program development and JOBS was implemented without legislation in July 1989.

MOST has an assessment-based design, in the sense that no particular service, or sequence of services, is emphasized. Income maintenance workers inform applicants and recipients about JOBS and refer them to the MOST Workers. These case managers have responsibility for the primary JOBS functions, including orientation to JOBS; the initial assessment and employability plan development; arranging for education, employment, and training services; providing or purchasing supportive services; and monitoring participants.

All mandated and elective education, training, and employment activities are authorized under MOST. Post-secondary education is not listed as a JOBS component in the state plan, but many participants are in post-secondary education, which is considered a self-initiated activity. With the exception of job readiness activities, which were added to comply with the Family Support Act, all JOBS services were permitted under the 1984 law. Moreover, Michigan already devoted significant resources to the types of long-term human capital services encouraged by JOBS. This means that JOBS implementation has not produced a dramatic shift in the types of services provided. Relative to other states in the sample, high proportions of participants are attending two-year and four-year colleges, all as a self-initiated activity. Very low proportions are participating in on-the-job training and work supplementation.

The Michigan Department of Social Services administers MOST through its local offices. Compared to the other state-administered programs in the sample, local offices in Michigan are given more discretion to design their own JOBS program. Each local office develops its JOBS plan, with some flexibility to choose the services that meet the needs of the local labor market. Although the state plan authorizes all four elective services, each office does not have to offer all services. Local offices also have considerable responsibility for obtaining services from local providers, either by contracting to purchase services or by obtaining them on a non-reimbursable basis. A list of local service providers attached to the state's JOBS plan suggests that there is a greater variety of arrangements for obtaining services in Michigan than in the other state-administered programs in the sample.

Participation in MOST is mandatory for all non-exempt recipients, and only parents with children under age one are exempt. But in practice, the program enlists a sufficient number of participants so that strong compulsion is unnecessary. An innovative policy excuses some parents from participation. As stated in the Department of Social Services manual, "If a person who is a mandatory participant provides child care in her home for MOST Program participants, she shall be considered as meeting the program participation requirements."

Michigan has not faced great difficulty in meeting the federal mandates regarding participation and targeting, although it is having difficulty with the 20-hour rule and the federal reporting requirements. Prior to JOBS implementation, MOST served enough people that the 7 percent participation requirement did not necessitate a significant increase in participation. Nor did the state need to take special actions to meet the targeting requirements.

MINNESOTA: PROJECT STRIDE

In 1987, after considerable deliberation, Minnesota enacted a welfare employment program whose design is strikingly similar to JOBS. It offered a wide range of education, training, and employment services, targeted expenditures to long-term AFDC recipients and individuals at risk of long-term dependency, required an orientation to the program for all recipients, offered case management, and increased funding for child care. With general consensus about this program, there was bipartisan support for the legislation needed to implement JOBS. Under the name of Project STRIDE — Success Through Reaching Individual Development and Employment — JOBS was implemented statewide in July 1989.

Public assistance programs in Minnesota are supervised by the state Department of Human Services (DHS) and administered by county governments. Direct responsibility for welfare employment programs rests with local governments, which contract for the operation of Project STRIDE components with certified local employment and training service providers. A high proportion of these providers are also providers of JTPA services.

The state Department of Jobs and Training (DJT), created in 1985, helps manage the state's employment and training programs. Under an interagency agreement between the DHS and the DJT, the DHS retains responsibility for supervising the initial activities for welfare recipients, including the orientation, the identification of mandatory participants, and the referral of recipients to the employment and training service providers. DJT is given responsibility for reviewing local STRIDE plans for DHS approval, certifying, assisting, and monitoring local employment and training service providers, and establishing reporting requirements. The local employment and training service providers perform all case management functions, including assessment, employability plan development, and referral to services.

STRIDE is an assessment-based program which, like its predecessor, emphasizes services designed to increase earning capacity over the long term. Counties must offer job search and at least one of the other three employment components. It is unclear whether the implementation of STRIDE has changed the mix of services, but there are some indications that access to post-secondary education has been increased by the child care entitlement and that the 20-hour rule may have increased the number of hours spent in GED and adult basic education activities. Case management is considered to be a central component of the program, although only certain groups are eligible for case management services. The certified employment and training service providers are responsible for case management, and their certification depends in part on their experience and capability in delivering these services.

Minnesota has strongly emphasized the voluntary nature of its program and the opportunities it offers to recipients. Only three components of STRIDE are mandatory. First, all non-exempt AFDC caretakers must attend a STRIDE orientation, which must include directions on how recipients can volunteer. Second, custodial parents under the age of 20 who lack a high school diploma must attend school or pursue a GED. Finally, the principal wage earner in an AFDC-UP family must participate in job search.

Unlike any other study state, Minnesota has enacted legislation restricting access to the program. While other states have established priorities for service, Minnesota has responded to scarce funding for services and child care by explicitly choosing to serve only specific groups of recipients. During the period of the study, participation was restricted to the two mandatory groups listed above, subgroups of the three federal target groups, participants in two demonstration projects, and recipients participating at the time these legislative restrictions were imposed. Despite these restrictions, Minnesota exceeds the federally mandated rates of participation and targeting of expenditures.

MISSISSIPPI: JOBS

When the Family Support Act was passed, Mississippi operated a small WIN program that had declined during the 1980's with the decrease in federal funding. The WIN Demonstration program was introduced in 1989, in part as a possible model for JOBS, but it operated in only six of the state's 84 counties. The state's WIN Demonstration staff consisted of eight people — two supervisors and six social workers. WIN offered job search, job readiness activities, and work experience. Training and education were also WIN components, although no funds were available to purchase these services and they were obtained only by referral to the JTPA and education providers.

Unlike most states in the sample, which implemented JOBS by modifying their existing WIN Demonstration programs, Mississippi chose to make a significant organizational change. In 1989, prior to JOBS implementation, Governor Ray Mabus consolidated several state agencies into a new Department of Human Services (DHS). In creating the new agency, many leadership positions were transferred from white to black administrators. For these new leaders, JOBS presented the opportunity to alter the operational structure of welfare employment programs and to place new people in positions of responsibility. Instead of building on the WIN Demonstration, and relying on the staff that had long run the local welfare offices, DHS is contracting with local community action agencies (CAAs) for the administration of JOBS. These changes in administration and the state's budget crisis delayed JOBS until October 1990, when it was implemented in 9 of Mississippi's 84 counties. Legislation was not required, except to approve the budget.

Under the contract between DHS and the community action agencies, the CAAs provide case management services. AFDC recipients are screened by the DHS eligibility worker in the local DHS office and those who are non-exempt or volunteer for JOBS are referred to the CAA case management unit. The CAA is responsible for orientation, assessment, development of the employability plan, and referral to education, employment, and training services. Child care is arranged by a third group of agencies, local Child Care Management Agencies, which are also under contract to DHS.

Despite these important changes in administrative and operational structure, it is not clear that the programmatic structure of JOBS will be different from WIN. JOBS in Mississippi is designed to be an assessment-based program. Clients who are job-ready are placed in job search, work experience, or on-the-job training. Clients who are not job- ready are referred to education, skills training, or a job readiness program. Instead of CWEP, which limits the number of hours of work, an alternate work experience program requiring up to 20 hours of work per week has been selected as an optional JOBS component. Work supplementation is not offered.

Although a wide range of JOBS components can be offered, funds to purchase services are limited. A small number of GED teachers will be funded under a contract with the state Department of Education, which will also conduct all basic literacy testing. Most services are being obtained on a non-reimbursable basis through memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between DHS and other state and local organizations. MOUs have been negotiated with local JTPA Service Delivery Areas, the Department of Education, the state Employment Security Commission, and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Because the MOUs do not commit the other agencies to serving a specific number of JOBS clients, the extent of forthcoming services is not yet clear. In the absence of funds to purchase most education and training services or firm commitments from other agencies to supply services without funding, some observers outside DHS believe that JOBS will be tilted toward low cost services.

With resources very limited, Mississippi is giving priority to volunteers. First priority is given to volunteers from the target groups and second priority to other volunteers. If an insufficient number of people volunteer, participation will become mandatory. Parents with children under age three are exempt, a decision prompted both by funding limitations and a concern with the mother-child relationship in early childhood. The decision to focus on volunteers was made in the expectation that it would assist the state

in meeting the federal mandates for targeting and participation. Mississippi expects to meet these mandates, but information systems are not in place that yield reliable data on the number of recipients in the target groups or which participants meet the 20-hour rule for program participation.

NEW YORK: JOBS

Public assistance in New York is administered by the counties, which historically have exercised considerable discretion in the design and scope of their employment and training programs. During the 1980s, the state gave counties the authority to offer all of the mandatory and elective program components now required by JOBS, and many counties introduced new, sometimes innovative, programs. When JOBS was enacted, the rate of participation in these programs was sufficiently high that a major state initiative was unnecessary. Before JOBS, however, the state had not mandated a specific sequence, range, or content of services. To implement JOBS, the state needed to mandate a more specific program on the counties and to narrow their scope of discretion.

Unlike most states in the sample, New York required legislation to implement JOBS. The governor's bill was introduced in early 1989, aiming at a July 1989 implementation date. The bill sparked extensive debate in the legislature, caused by fundamental disagreement over the relative emphasis to be given to providing opportunities for clients versus imposing obligations on them. The debate delayed implementation until October 1990, when JOBS was implemented statewide. It also revealed a wide range of views about program design and the likelihood of continued variation around the state.

JOBS in New York has an assessment-based design, with the exception that counties have the option of assigning recipients to job search for up to three weeks before completing an assessment. Each county is required to make available all of the mandatory and elective JOBS components, although post-secondary education is limited to two years. Counties must offer case management to parents under age 18 and to other priority groups as resources permit. Because few resources have been allocated for case management, it cannot now be expected to play a central role in the program.

In the debate over enabling state legislation, a major point of contention was whether participation in JOBS would be mandatory or voluntary. The legislative compromise gives each county the option of operating a voluntary program after it meets the federal mandates concerning participation rates and targeting of expenditures. However, state regulations currently require that all nonexempt recipients participate in JOBS. Parents with children under age three are exempt. The legislation also requires that a parent who requests help in finding child care be offered at least two choices of regulated providers. If regulated care is unavailable or inaccessible, the parent can be excused from participation.

Because JOBS is administered by the counties, the state Department of Social Services (DSS) does not take primary responsibility for purchasing services or obtaining services on a non-reimbursable basis. No formal agreement for service delivery has been reached between DSS and the state JTPA agency. Instead, the state mandates a local planning process that requires coordination among local service providers, including the JTPA. DSS and the State Education Department have negotiated several cooperative initiatives that link education and social services. The Department of Labor, which had received all federal WIN funds, continues to receive approximately the same amount of funds and will provide job search, job development, and job placement services.

The state is confident that it is meeting the federal mandates concerning participation and targeting. The statewide participation rate exceeded 7 percent prior to JOBS implementation and participation is being expanded. However, with few interagency agreements negotiated at the state level, counties will continue to have discretion in how they spend JOBS funds and obtain services on a non-reimbursable basis. While more emphasis is clearly being placed on education at the state level, the counties must take the initiative in designing programs and still have considerable discretion over program operations.

OKLAHOMA:

EDUCATION, TRAINING & EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (ET&E)

Oklahoma has a long tradition of welfare employment programs, focusing its efforts on promoting employment. Under the WIN Demonstration program, the state had the authority to offer a wide range of services, including the types of education, employment, and training services mandated or permitted under JOBS. However, the state placed heaviest emphasis on moving recipients directly into employment through job search, job placement, and work experience. An illustration of this emphasis on employment, and a unique feature of Oklahoma's WIN Demonstration, was the decision to require parents with children under age six to participate in WIN. Under a waiver from the exemptions specified in federal law, employment and participation in WIN components was authorized for parents with infants and pre-school children.

With this waiver in place, and a mature work experience and job placement program in operation, Oklahoma needed to make relatively few immediate extensions in eligibility or service components to implement JOBS. By administrative regulation, Oklahoma implemented JOBS statewide in July 1989. The name of the program, Education, Training and Employment (ET&E), was not changed. Responsibility for the program continues to rest with the State of Oklahoma Department of Human Services (DHS), which administers public assistance and ET&E through its county offices.

ET&E has an assessment-based design, with the exception that three weeks of self-directed job search may be required prior to eligibility determination. DHS staff perform most JOBS functions, including assessment, development of the employability plan, job readiness activities, group job search, job placement, and referral to education and training. DHS staff also provide information about child care and assist parents in locating child care providers. Formally, the state does not offer case management, but the assignment of responsibilities within the county offices permits staff to perform many case management functions.

All mandated and elective education, training, and employment components except CWEP are authorized under the state plan. Post-secondary education, including both two- and four-year college, is also permitted. As an alternative to CWEP, which limits the number of weekly hours of work, the state has opted for a state work experience program in which clients may be assigned for up to 40 hours a week of work experience.

Few education and training services have been obtained under contract, and only a small share of ET&E funds have been used to purchase these services. Most services have been obtained on a non-reimbursable basis through agreements reached between the DHS and other state agencies. Cooperative agreements between DHS and the 12 Service Delivery Areas of the JTPA, which were negotiated several years prior to JOBS, give the JTPA a role in providing services.

ET&E is a mandatory program and, while volunteers are given priority as specified in the federal legislation, no special procedure has been developed to recruit volunteers. Participation by parents with children under one year of age is not required, thereby relieving this group from the pressures placed upon them prior to JOBS.

At the time of JOBS implementation, Oklahoma was already serving enough clients so that the 7 percent participation rate did not necessitate a significant increase in overall program activity. The state achieved a 29 percent participation rate in federal fiscal year 1990 and has set the same goal for 1991. Because of the extent of participation prior to JOBS, this high level of participation does not represent a dramatic increase in the availability of education, employment, and training for AFDC recipients. However, a large proportion of ET&E clients participate in educational activities, and state administrators believe that JOBS implementation has meant a greater emphasis on educational services.

OREGON:

JOBS

Two distinctly different WIN Demonstration programs were developed in Oregon, one beginning in 1982 and the other in 1988. The first emphasized job search, with the objective of encouraging employment, limiting the growth of the AFDC caseload, and reducing welfare costs. It succeeded in meeting these goals, as indicated by a sharp decline in the percent of the poor receiving public assistance, but earned a reputation for excessive sanctioning and punitiveness. Welfare advocates and others concerned with these results pressed for a new program that would encourage employment, but do so through an array of human capital investment services. In February 1988, a new program offering all the mandatory and elective JOBS components, and emphasizing enhanced opportunities for participants, was introduced in seven pilot areas around the state. With this program in place, JOBS was implemented through administrative regulations in October 1990.

At the time of implementation, JOBS did not operate statewide in Oregon. The state is divided into 15 service districts, and only the seven districts that were pilot areas for the WIN Demonstration offered full-service programs. According to Oregon's State Plan for JOBS, the remaining districts generally lack job skills training programs, which are required under the Family Support Act, and offer only job search as an elective component. Oregon is relying on the seven districts with full-service programs to meet the federally mandated participation rate in 1991.

Unlike other states in the sample, JOBS in Oregon does not have a purely assessment-based design for all participants. The seven full-service JOBS districts offer a program of specific services. Participants are given an initial assessment and the great majority are then referred to the "Enhanced Employment and Training Track." This track begins with the "Workplace Basics Component," which is composed of specific services: an extensive set of job readiness activities, followed if needed by basic educational services such as high school education and GED. A large fraction of JOBS funds are spent on these job readiness activities, and a large fraction of JOBS clients participate in them. After completing the Workplace Basics Component, participants are referred to the remaining JOBS services based on their assessed needs. A smaller number of recipients, perhaps as few as 5 percent of participants, are referred to the "Placement Track" and moved directly into job search skills training.

In the eight other districts, participants are given an initial assessment and are then referred to either the "Employment Track" or the "Education Track." The Education Track offers all the educational components required under JOBS, but the Employment Track offers only selected job readiness activities followed by job search and job placement. Case management is offered throughout the state, although the level of service is expected to be higher in the full-service districts. In these districts, the workers are called "case managers" and are given a smaller caseload than workers in the eight other districts, where they are called "case coordinators."

In all districts, a separate program has been established for young parents age 16–19. The Young Parents component is intended to provide the individualized attention and support services needed for teen parents to complete high school or the equivalent. Case managers monitor them closely and contract for the counseling and other intervention services needed to complete school and develop the attitudes, behaviors, and skills required to participate in the regular JOBS program.

Public assistance in Oregon is administered by the state welfare agency and its district offices, but efforts have been made to establish a "partnership" with other state agencies and to decentralize administration to the local level. A prime contractor is designated in each of the 15 JOBS districts — the JTPA is the prime contractor in nine districts and the community college in the remaining six districts — and about 75 percent of funds for JOBS services are contracted through them. Each district welfare office works with the prime contractor and other local providers to develop a local JOBS plan that meets the district's particular client and labor market needs. A new unit within the state Economic Development Department negotiates these contracts and monitors

compliance, including meeting the federal mandates. So far, there have been no formal agreements among state agencies to provide services to JOBS participants on a non-reimbursable basis.

Participation in JOBS is mandatory, with exemptions given to parents with children under age three. First priority for service is given to people who are job-ready and to teen parents. In the belief that motivated recipients are more likely to achieve self-sufficiency, the state encourages both non-exempt and exempt AFDC recipients to volunteer. Compared to the program in place prior to 1988, which imposed sanctions frequently, JOBS is intended to be "uplifting and encouraging."

Expenditures for JOBS in Oregon are expected to be higher relative to the size of its caseload than in any other state in the sample. The state plans to draw down its full federal JOBS entitlement for 1991 and to spend additional state funds that will not be matched with federal funds. Prior to JOBS, Oregon served considerably more recipients than needed to meet the 7 percent participation requirement. Although it will continue to exceed this minimum during the first nine months of JOBS implementation, it expects to serve fewer recipients than before JOBS.

PENNSYLVANIA: NEW DIRECTIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT

Until 1987, Pennsylvania's efforts to promote the employment of welfare recipients consisted primarily of a WIN Demonstration program emphasizing job search and CWEP. In that year, a new governor initiated the program that would become the model and primary vehicle for JOBS implementation, the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) program. SPOC is a joint effort of three state agencies — welfare, labor, and education — and operates through the JTPA Service Delivery Areas. It is similar to JOBS in that it uses intensive case management, offers a wide range of education, employment, and training services, and relies heavily on interagency coordination.

With passage of the Family Support Act, the obvious vehicle for implementing JOBS was SPOC rather than WIN. SPOC operated in 16 of the state's 28 Service Delivery Areas prior to JOBS and was extended statewide when JOBS was implemented in October 1989. The design of the SPOC program is generally consistent with the federal JOBS legislation and the relatively minor revisions that were necessary could be carried out administratively. But while Pennsylvania is relying on SPOC to meet the federal JOBS mandates, SPOC itself is not the state's JOBS program.

SPOC is the operating core of Pennsylvania's implementation effort, but it is formally only one track of the state's JOBS program, which is called New Directions for Employment. New Directions is administered by the state Department of Welfare, which operates public assistance through its county offices. The county offices give nonexempt AFDC recipients an initial assessment and place them in an "enrollment pool." Recipients can then participate in either the SPOC track or the New Directions track, depending on their preferences and the availability of services.

Although the tracks look similar on paper, JOBS resources are concentrated on the SPOC program. In addition, the other agencies operating SPOC contribute resources under formal agreements negotiated at the state level. In contrast, less than a third of JOBS resources are allocated to the New Directions track, and they are used only for assessment and case management activities and for administrative costs. No JOBS resources are available for education, training, or employment services for the New Directions track, and arrangements for obtaining services from other organizations on a non-reimbursable basis are negotiated at the local level and vary from county to county. It is unclear how many people will be served by this track or whether they will participate for sufficient hours to meet the 20-hour rule.

The difference between the two tracks of New Directions is in funding levels, not program design. The design of both tracks is assessment-based and both tracks nominally offer the same set of services, including all mandatory and elective services except work supplementation. Case management is offered under both tracks, but considerably more resources are devoted to case management in SPOC. Under SPOC, colocation of the representatives of the local

SDA, the welfare agency, and the Job Service is strongly encouraged. Case management is provided by a team of representatives from these agencies, with formal procedures for communication among members of the team. Under New Directions, case management is handled by employment and training workers in the welfare agency with much less formal participation by workers from other state agencies. Moreover, New Directions case managers typically have much greater caseloads than their SPOC counterparts.

The SPOC program has always emphasized education and training, and the central role of SPOC in implementing JOBS means that most participants are in these types of activities. Few JOBS participants are engaged in on-the-job training or CWEP, and work supplementation is not offered. Because program resources are concentrated in providing relatively high-cost services that offer attractive opportunities to recipients, the demand for the limited number of slots is high.

Participation in New Directions is nominally mandatory for all non-exempt recipients. However, because the number of volunteers currently exceeds the availability of JOBS services, full participation in the majority of components is, in practice, voluntary. All non-exempt recipients must complete the orientation and initial assessment performed by the welfare agency and are then placed in an "enrollment pool." Exit from the hold status of the enrollment pool into either SPOC or the New Directions track is voluntary. To meet the targeting requirement, recipients in the target groups are given priority in the queue to leave the enrollment pool. Parents with children under age three are exempt from participation, largely because of the excess demand for services.

Pennsylvania's strategy for meeting the federal mandates concerning participation and targeting is to concentrate resources in the SPOC program. The state's intent is to give local providers the capacity to meet the federal mandates with an emphasis on relatively high cost education and training services. In 1990, this strategy appears successful when the participation rate is calculated based on scheduled hours. However, because of difficulties in monitoring participation, there is uncertainty regarding the proportion who meet the 75 percent attendance rate.

TENNESSEE: JOBS

Until 1988, Tennessee operated a modest WIN Demonstration program in one-third of its counties. In that year, partly in anticipation of the Family Support Act and the additional funds it would bring to the state for employment and training, the JTPA increased its focus on AFDC recipients. The Department of Labor (DOL), the agency administering the JTPA, entered into an agreement with the Department of Human Services (DHS) to earmark a specific amount of JTPA funds to provide employment and training services for AFDC recipients. This action, which more than tripled the resources available for AFDC recipients, positioned the JTPA to play a central role in JOBS.

An extremely tight state budget delayed JOBS implementation until October 1990 and resulted in a complete lack of new appropriations for education, training, and employment services. The only increased appropriations to implement JOBS were for child care. With no new funding for JOBS services, the state had to rely on the resources of the JTPA. The very limited JOBS funds are being used for assessment and employability plan development, supportive services, administrative costs, and a small amount for case management. All employment and training services are being obtained from the JTPA, which operates most aspects of the program.

Under a contract between the DHS and the DOL, the JTPA was given responsibility for delivering all JOBS and supportive services. Virtually all JOBS funds, as well as funds for child care, have been transferred to the DOL. The DOL, in turn, subcontracts with the JTPA Service Delivery Areas. The contract between DHS and DOL requires that at least 2,023 AFDC recipients be served, the number needed to meet the 7 percent participation requirement.

The DHS is responsible for the JOBS orientation and for screening individuals to identify those who wish to participate in the program. Volunteers are then referred to the local JTPA office. The JTPA completes the assessment and employability plan, places an individual in a service component, and arranges supportive services. If compliance issues

arise, clients are referred back to DHS for conciliation, determination of good cause, and sanctions.

JOBS has an assessment-based design, relying on the assessment and employability plan processes of the SDAs. Of the elective JOBS components, Tennessee offers job search and on-the-job training, as well as post-secondary education for up to four years. Because the SDAs operate the program, they control the mix of services offered to participants. It is not yet clear how JOBS implementation has altered this mix, although there appears to be more emphasis on remedial education and self-initiated post-secondary education.

Initial enrollment in JOBS is voluntary. Because funds for JOBS are so limited, the state's strategy for meeting the 7 percent participation rate is to concentrate resources on people who are most motivated. When AFDC recipients are in the DHS for orientation and screening, they are informed about the option to volunteer for JOBS. Only those wishing to participate are referred to the JTPA. Once they have enrolled in JOBS, however, sanctions can be applied if they fail to continue to participate. The threat of sanctions is designed to help ensure their ongoing participation. To limit the number of people that must be served, the state exempts parents with children under age three.

Tennessee appears able to meet the 7 percent participation requirement. The JTPA, in its contract with DHS, made a firm commitment to achieve this standard. This level of services for AFDC recipients is clearly higher than before the JTPA moved aggressively to serve them in 1988. But it is less certain that JOBS implementation has so far meant a significant expansion of services. In the opinion of some observers, this will require state appropriations for JOBS services rather than almost total reliance on the resources of the JTPA.

TEXAS:

WINNING INDEPENDENCE GAINING SUCCESS (WINGS)

Until recently, Texas placed little emphasis on welfare employment programs, relying on low welfare benefits and restrictive eligibility rules to limit welfare expenditures. WIN and the WIN Demonstration were modest programs, generally not operated statewide, that aimed primarily at immediate employment. Because the Department of Human Services (DHS) devoted few resources to job training or remediation, the JTPA became the primary source of education and training services for welfare recipients.

In 1988, just prior to passage of the Family Support Act, the DHS leadership embarked on a welfare employment initiative with more of a human capital emphasis. Because resources for this initiative were very limited, it used a triage approach to allocate services to clients. The passage of JOBS overtook the full implementation of this program, but its triage approach has been incorporated into the design of JOBS. JOBS was implemented in October 1990 in 82 of the state's 254 counties, containing approximately 90 percent of the state's AFDC caretakers.

The design of JOBS specifies that DHS outreach all members of the target groups, regardless of their exemption status, and administer an initial screening. Based on this screening, clients are sorted into one of three Service Levels. Service Level I clients, defined as those without significant barriers to employment and with either a high school education or recent work experience, are referred for job search and placement services. Service Level II clients, those with no significant barriers to employment and with nine to eleven years of education, are to be provided with case management and referral to education, training, and job placement assistance. Service Level III clients, those with less than a ninth-grade education or significant barriers to employment, are to be provided with only a referral packet containing information about other services available in the community.

The Texas DHS has historically contracted with other organizations for substantial portions of its limited welfare employment services. Under JOBS, services for Service Level I clients are being purchased through competitive contracts with various public and private organizations. Contracts for nine counties, including the state's three largest counties, were won by Maximus, a private, for-profit company. Funds appropriated for adult education are being used to purchase services under contract, and various child care services will be contracted out as well.

Few additional funds have been appropriated for education, employment, and training activities. The state legislature limited appropriations for the Family Support Act to programs and services that are mandated by the federal legislation. As a result, significant amounts of funds were appropriated for child care, transitional benefits, and AFDC-UP (for six months of the year). However, the Act was not interpreted as mandating expenditures on education, training, and employment services and the state is relying on obtaining most services without payment. Of the elective JOBS components, the Texas state plan authorizes job search and on-the-job training and permits post-secondary education for two years. State funds are being spent for case management, job search, education, transportation, and other supportive services, but the amounts are extremely limited relative to the size of the caseload. In many respects, the JTPA is the primary component of the state's strategy for implementing JOBS.

The Texas JOBS program is viewed in the state as a mandatory program for nonexempt recipients. However, the limited funding has forced the state to set priorities among recipient groups. Outreach efforts are concentrated on members of the target groups, and additional priorities have been set for calling recipients in to be screened for JOBS services. Clients screened into the Service Level III category are in effect excused from participation. The state's prioritizing means that, in practice, JOBS is more mandatory for some nonexempt clients than for others.

It is premature to assess whether and how JOBS has increased the availability of services for AFDC recipients. The only new state appropriation for education, employment, and training services was $1 million for adult education, which was matched by $1.7 million in federal funds. Without other spending, it currently appears that adult education may be the only service that is in greater supply as a result of JOBS. The JTPA served significant numbers of AFDC recipients prior to JOBS and will continue to do so. However, the DHS has not negotiated a formal agreement with the JTPA at the state level and must persuade the individual SDAs to adjust their activities to meet the requirements of JOBS. It is also premature to assess whether Texas is meeting the 7 percent participation requirement. A raw count of participants places the participation rate at just under 8 percent, but the rate may be quite different using the methodology prescribed by the federal regulations.

III

LEADERSHIP, FUNDING, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Although the Family Support Act was the product of a long and heated Congressional debate, it has been described as representing a new consensus among liberals and conservatives on the direction of welfare reform. Agencies administering welfare programs should assume an obligation to provide the education, training, and other support that recipients need in order to become self-sufficient; recipients, in turn, should be obligated to take advantage of these opportunities. In this section, we consider whether the states' governors, legislators, and welfare administrators embraced this vision of JOBS as a significant new obligation of government and whether they exercised leadership to make this vision a reality in their states.

We first consider whether state leaders presented JOBS to the public as a major federal initiative requiring a significant state response. We then examine the extent to which state legislatures appropriated additional funds for JOBS in response to the increased federal matching funds and mandates. Last, we consider whether state welfare administrators exercised leadership within their agencies to strengthen management and staffing for the delivery of JOBS components.

PRESENTING JOBS TO THE PUBLIC

The Family Support Act was presented to the nation as a new social contract between government and welfare recipients that would change the focus of welfare from a cash assistance program to an education, training, and employment program. Did governors and other state officials mobilize support and resources for this vision of welfare reform as states framed their response to the federal law?

In contrast to the dramatic rhetoric at the federal level, elected and appointed leaders in the study states introduced JOBS with relatively little fanfare. The low profile given to JOBS implementation stems from the fact that many of the states had opted for welfare employment programs prior to JOBS and had already charted a course in keeping with the objectives of the federal legislation. The low profile introduction of JOBS was also fostered by the revenue shortfalls faced by many states and by the identification of other initiatives, such as education, as state priorities.

When the Family Support Act was passed in 1988, it was hailed as "the most sweeping overhaul of the nation's welfare system in half a century" (Rovner, 1988b). Supporters described the new law as a landmark, both in expanding opportunities for recipients and in expressing a new philosophy about welfare. Expanded opportunities for education and training, together with the necessary child care and other supportive services, could change the focus of AFDC from providing cash assistance to delivering employment and training services (Rovner, 1988a). These opportunities could alter the philosophy of public assistance by per-

mitting a new social contract between welfare recipients and the state. The social contract would be based on the mutual obligations of both parties. The state has an obligation to meet the needs of poor families, but in exchange for income support and a range of employment and support services, the poor have an obligation to make efforts on their own behalf.

Did state leaders present their implementation of JOBS to the public as a sweeping overhaul of their welfare system? Did they move aggressively to create public support for the new program? Did they embrace the vision of JOBS as a new social contract, requiring new obligations on the part of government and recipients?

Leaders in most of the 10 states did not adopt the public posture toward JOBS that was taken at the federal level. JOBS was generally implemented without fanfare and with little effort by leaders to convince the general public that the program expands opportunities for recipients or redefines the social contract. In most states, JOBS implementation did not spark political debate or become a highly visible political issue.

Several factors explain the states' decisions to take a low profile toward JOBS implementation. The majority of states had designed and implemented new welfare employment programs in the years just prior to JOBS, in response to the options offered by the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act and subsequent federal amendments. The politics and personalities behind each state's program are different: some programs were the product of considerable debate, while others reflected the strong initiative of a governor or agency administrator. But all these states had charted a course prior to JOBS, and the programs already in place set the tone and direction for JOBS implementation.

Looking across the 10 states, it appears that most state leaders saw little political capital to be made from the issue of welfare reform. In several of the states that had introduced welfare employment programs before JOBS, their program was presented to the public as part of an economic development strategy, rather than as a welfare strategy per se. In Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, the operation of welfare employment programs was linked to other education and training programs aimed at economic development. In Oklahoma, the governor articulated a belief in education and training as important to the state's economic recovery and its efforts to become competitive in the world economy. These anticipated benefits, as well as the expected cost savings to government, built support for Oklahoma's welfare employment activities.

In the states that had not taken significant initiatives prior to JOBS, welfare is typically viewed as a no-win issue for politicians and few adopted a high-profile public stance on welfare reform. In the words of the report of one field associate, "Except for periodic efforts to cut benefit levels, or to attempt to enforce mandatory workfare provisions, recent governors have not shown any deep or abiding interest in welfare reform or demonstrated real commitment to its funding." The incentives and mandates in JOBS did not encourage leaders in these states to change their approach to the problem of welfare dependency.

In only one state, Maryland, has the governor personally and repeatedly publicized the opportunities offered by JOBS. The governor focuses on the positive aspects of the program, both for clients and the state's economy. For example, the governor, his Employment and Training Council, and the Department of Employ-

ment and Economic Opportunity hold an annual awards ceremony each year to honor welfare recipients who leave welfare through Maryland's education and training programs. The ceremony typically receives favorable media coverage, often including stories about the experiences of specific individuals. Few other states have "marketed" JOBS to the public as extensively. Oklahoma also publicizes the positive aspects of its program, issuing press releases about successful participants. Texas has developed a "marketing plan" to increase the public's involvement in welfare reform generally and to gain public support for the programs that are part of it. However, the marketing plan is not closely linked to JOBS implementation.

Revenue shortfalls facing the states were another factor contributing to the low-profile response to JOBS. Although JOBS can be sold as a cost-saving program over the long run, tight budgets discourage initiatives that cannot generate savings in the short term. Finally, several state leaders had other programs at the tops of their agendas, particularly education for children, and attached lower priority to welfare reform.

JOBS implementation has not been highly controversial in most states. Only two states, New York and Minnesota, needed to pass legislation other than budget appropriations in order to implement JOBS. In the others, JOBS was implemented by administrative regulations, procedural memoranda, and other administrative mechanisms. With the exception of New York, these activities stimulated little controversy at the state level. The reasons for this vary. In some states, such as Minnesota, Oregon and Pennsylvania, a lively debate about welfare employment policy had occurred in designing the earlier WIN Demonstration and Title IV-A work programs, and major issues appeared to be settled. In others, including states with mature WIN Demonstration programs and those with more modest programs, the initial phase of JOBS implementation did not demand a large infusion of resources or major programmatic changes that could stimulate a reexamination of welfare employment policy.

In New York, in contrast, the need to enact enabling legislation sparked an 18-month debate about fundamental philosophical issues: should JOBS be mandatory or voluntary; should it begin with universal referral to job search; should high-cost or low-cost services be emphasized; should developmental child care be encouraged? While all states must answer these questions in order to implement JOBS, the need to pass legislation in New York forced the debate into the public arena (Lurie & Sanger, 1991).

Discussion

The Family Support Act was passed after an exciting period of state experimentation with the new options offered by the legislation of the early 1980s. All the study states chose to experiment with at least some of these options, and about half of the states made significant efforts to redesign their welfare employment programs. Passage of the Act was viewed by some observers as representing a new national consensus about the desirability of these programs, and other states were expected to follow the lead of the innovators.

The experience of the study states suggests that whatever consensus was reached at the federal level has not been reached throughout the nation. The extended debate in New York illustrates the potentially contentious issues that must be addressed in designing a JOBS program. Several states, including Minnesota,

Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania, had already debated many of these issues in designing their pre-JOBS programs. Maryland was able to avoid public debate through the strong leadership of its governor. But Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas have yet to begin a public debate. In the absence of debate and visible leadership, efforts to implement JOBS have been modest in these states.

FUNDING FOR JOBS SERVICES OTHER THAN CHILD CARE

The Family Support Act increases federal financing for welfare employment programs, matching each state's expenditures up to a limit that depends on its welfare caseload. How have states responded to the more generous federal support?

States are making widely varying efforts to fund JOBS services. The majority are spending considerably more on JOBS than on previous welfare employment programs. Oregon plans to spend enough, or almost enough, to draw down its full allocation of federal funds, while Mississippi and Tennessee have appropriated very limited additional revenues for JOBS services. Administrators in half the states attributed their states' decisions to limit expenditures to constrained fiscal conditions. Funding may also have been restricted by the need to comply with mandates of the Family Support Act to provide AFDC-UP benefits, child care, and transitional benefits.

The Family Support Act significantly increases the federal funds available for welfare employment programs and for the child care needed to participate in them. Under WIN and the WIN Demonstration program, the federal government paid 90 percent of state expenditures for WIN services and child care, up to each state's allotment of the federal appropriations. The state's 10 percent match could be in cash or in kind, enabling states to draw down virtually all of the appropriated federal funds. But WIN appropriations were capped at a level that was never sufficient to serve many AFDC recipients and appropriations were cut substantially by the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA).

A second source of federal support for welfare employment programs was funding for the optional activities introduced by the 1981 OBRA and subsequent legislation. The OBRA legislation allowed states to establish Community Work Experience Programs (CWEP) and authorized waivers for grant diversion programs. In 1982, legislation permitting states to operate job search programs was enacted and in 1984 the grant diversion option was broadened into the work supplementation program. State expenditures for CWEP, job search, and work supplementation were funded as part of AFDC administrative costs. Along with other administrative costs, these Title IV-A work programs were supported by uncapped federal grants at a 50 percent matching rate.

In the years between OBRA and JOBS implementation, total expenditures for WIN and the Title IV-A work programs declined. Federal funding for WIN fell sharply following OBRA, from $365 million in federal fiscal year 1981 to $126 million in 1987 and $93 million in 1988. As states opted for the Title IV-A work programs, federal funding for these activities rose from $2.5 million in 1984, to $50 million in 1987, and to $94 million in 1988. Because states paid 10 percent of WIN costs but 50 percent of the costs of the Title IV-A programs, they bore an increasing share of the cost of welfare employment programs. State funding reported for both programs rose from about $40 million in 1981 to $104 million in 1988, while federal funding declined from $365 to $186 million.

By 1988, the majority of the study states were making greater expenditures under the Title IV-A work programs than under WIN. Tables 4A and 4B, which are

based on the Title IV-A expenditures reported by the states in claiming federal matching funds, indicate that only half the states spent more under these programs than under WIN. But the data in the table underreport Title IV-A expenditures, since some states reported them as general administrative costs, which are

TABLE 4A: Federal Share of Funding for JOBS and Prior Welfare Employment Programs

	WIN		Title IV-A Work Programs	
	1987	1988	1987	1988
Maryland[1]	$ 2,383,243	$ 1,750,567	$ 396,300	$ 550,116
Michigan	9,080,277	6,669,752	3,242,298	8,675,586
Minnesota[1]	2,528,715	1,852,573	66,314	37,339
Mississippi	959,258	702,766	0	0
New York[1]	10,889,510	7,998,691	0	0
Oklahoma	758,288	556,986	1,499,028	1,414,606
Oregon	3,503,041	2,573,095	5,442,477	8,334,340
Pennsylvania	5,719,452	4,201,119	1,060,169	2,635,816
Tennessee	1,236,493	908,243	0	0
Texas	2,604,903	1,913,384	5,944,067	6,405,492
U.S.	$126,000,000	$92,551,000	$50,234,871	$93,714,600

	JOBS Expenditures Other Than Child Care			
	1990		1991	
	Limit of Entitlement	Expenditures	Limit of Entitlement	Expenditures[2]
Maryland	$ 13,360,389	$ 10,346,095	$ 16,798,195	$ 11,626,458
Michigan	51,251,735	23,016,312	62,930,483	22,235,704
Minnesota	12,782,073	8,039,841	16,754,438	9,410,166
Mississippi	—	—	12,732,546	1,365,279
New York	—	—	87,192,206	41,324,102
Oklahoma	6,781,421	4,911,394	9,002,988	5,252,532
Oregon	—	—	10,374,764	8,745,889
Pennsylvania	38,388,865	16,804,687	47,126,045	16,730,720
Tennessee	—	—	17,112,901	1,846,282
Texas	—	—	45,920,072	20,901,382
U.S.	$800,000,000	$285,475,564	$1,000,000,000	$479,299,224

1 Expenditures on IV-A work programs in New York were counted as administrative costs in claiming federal reimbursement and were not reported separately. In Maryland and Minnesota, the other states with county-administered public assistance programs, expenditures on IV-A work programs may be underreported.
2 Excludes $109 million of unliquidated obligations.
Source: Department of Health and Human Services

matched at the same 50 percent rate. New York, for example, spent considerably more for Title IV-A activities than for WIN, but claimed them as administrative costs. As a county-administered system, the state was unable to isolate Title IV-A costs from other administrative expenditures. This pattern of claiming may also have lowered the expenditures reported by Maryland and Minnesota, the other states with county-administered programs.

TABLE 4B: State Share of Funding for JOBS and Prior Welfare Employment Programs

	WIN [2]		Title IV-A Work Programs	
	1987	1988	1987	1988
Maryland[1]	$ 264,805	$ 194,507	$ 396,300	$ 550,116
Michigan	1,008,920	741,084	3,242,298	8,675,586
Minnesota[1]	280,968	205,841	66,314	37,339
Mississippi	106,584	78,085	0	0
New York[1]	1,209,945	888,743	0	0
Oklahoma	84,254	61,887	1,499,028	1,414,606
Oregon	389,227	285,899	5,442,477	8,334,340
Pennsylvania	635,495	466,791	1,060,169	2,635,816
Tennessee	137,388	100,916	0	0
Texas	289,434	212,598	5,944,067	6,405,492
U.S.	$14,000,000	$10,283,444	$50,234,871	$93,714,600

	JOBS Expenditures Other Than Child Care	
	1990	1991
Maryland	$ 6,204,208	$ 6,898,756
Michigan	12,697,840	11,178,266
Minnesota	4,559,911	5,354,867
Mississippi	—	271,030
New York	—	25,369,694
Oklahoma	2,128,767	2,942,463
Oregon	—	4,487,913
Pennsylvania	8,958,639	8,479,636
Tennessee	—	518,523
Texas	—	15,661,855
U.S.	$183,886,655	$298,148,117

1 Expenditures on IV-A work programs in New York were counted as administrative costs in claiming federal reimbursement and were not reported separately. In Maryland and Minnesota, the other states with county-administered public assistance programs, expenditures on IV-A work programs may be underreported.

2 Estimated from federal share.

Source: Department of Health and Human Services

Under the Family Support Act, state expenditures for JOBS services other than child care are matched at three rates, depending on the level and purpose of the expenditure. Federal matching for JOBS is (a) 90 percent of expenditures up to each state's 1987 federal WIN allotment, shown in the first column at the top of Table 4A; (b) a varying percentage, equal to the greater of each state's Medicaid matching rate or 60 percent, of the remaining expenditures for JOBS activities and services; and (c) 50 percent of expenditures for transportation and other work-related supportive services and for administrative costs. The total federal match for JOBS is capped at $600 million in federal fiscal year 1989, $800 million in 1990, $1 billion in 1991, 1992, and 1993, $1.1 billion in 1994, and $1.3 billion in 1995. The allocation of these capped entitlements among the states depends on the number of adult AFDC recipients in each state. Table 4A presents the limits of each state's entitlement in 1990 and 1991.

Expenditures on JOBS Services other than Child Care

States in the study are making widely varying efforts to fund JOBS services, as shown in Tables 4A and 4B. All states except Oregon are spending more on JOBS than they reported spending under WIN and the Title IV-A work programs, and some are spending considerably more. Several states are spending enough to match most of their federal JOBS entitlement. However, two states have devoted few additional resources to the program and are drawing down a small share of their potential federal funds.

Of the five states that implemented JOBS by the beginning of federal fiscal year 1990, only Maryland and Oklahoma drew down more than 70 percent of their 1990 federal entitlement. Minnesota drew down 63 percent of its 1990 entitlement and both Michigan and Pennsylvania drew down 44 percent. Preliminary information on expenditures for federal fiscal year 1991 indicates that the rate of spending has increased somewhat in Maryland, Minnesota, and Oklahoma and is unchanged in Pennsylvania and Michigan. Because the federal entitlements are increasing, these states are spending a smaller share of their entitlement than they did in 1990.

Of the states that implemented JOBS at the beginning of fiscal year 1991, preliminary information indicates that Oregon has spent enough to receive 84 percent of its federal entitlement. New York and Texas are spending enough to draw down slightly less than half of their potential federal funding, which represents a larger percentage increase in spending in Texas than in New York. Mississippi and Tennessee, which have budgeted extremely limited amounts for the employment and training components of JOBS, are expected to draw down less than 15 percent of their federal entitlement.

Oregon is the only state in the sample that has appropriated more than is required to draw down its full federal entitlement. In the first nine months of JOBS implementation, Oregon planned to spend $6.5 million more of its own-source revenue than is required to satisfy the federal match. However, delays in contracting and introducing program components have prevented Oregon from achieving this spending level in 1991.

Tennessee, in contrast, is the only state that appropriated no additional state revenues for JOBS education, employment, and training services, focusing its appropriations for JOBS on child care expenditures. State administrators attribute this decision in part to the state's narrow tax base, but also to the availability of

funds from the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) to cover training costs. Beginning in 1988, Tennessee has earmarked a substantial share of its JTPA funds for services to AFDC recipients. In implementing JOBS, Tennessee increased the extent of such earmarking and thus relieved the pressures to use state revenues to fund JOBS.

In summary, based on the states' projections of their JOBS expenditures and preliminary information for 1991, states can be divided into four groups. Low expenditure states — Mississippi and Tennessee — are drawing down less than 15 percent of their federal entitlements of JOBS funds. A middle group — Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas — are spending enough to draw down 35 to 50 percent of their entitlements. Maryland, Minnesota, and Oklahoma are receiving between 55 and 70 percent of their potential federal funds, and Oregon is expected to draw down almost all its federal entitlement.

Tight state budgets contributed to the decision of many states to limit JOBS expenditures. Six of the 10 states were judged to be facing a deficit or were otherwise under fiscal stress in early 1990, as shown in Table 1, and fiscal conditions generally worsened for these states and others during the year. State administrators in Michigan, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas view fiscal conditions as a major reason for their state's decision to limit spending for JOBS.

It is noteworthy that state revenue shortfalls in New York, which have been serious since the state's first appropriations for JOBS were made, are not viewed as a primary factor limiting JOBS expenditures. State administrators place the responsibility for limiting expenditures on the counties, which finance approximately half of the non-federal share of the cost. Counties are not given an allocation for JOBS, but rather initiate expenditures and claim reimbursement from the state. Since JOBS implementation, they have not increased their spending enough to exhaust the funds budgeted by the state.

Competition for Funds

Other mandates of the Family Support Act can potentially dampen JOBS expenditures. Beginning in October 1990, all states must offer the AFDC-Unemployed Parent (UP) program to two-parent families, although states without previous AFDC-UP programs have the option of limiting the duration of benefits to six months out of any twelve-month period. Medicaid must be provided to AFDC-UP families without any time limitation. Of the states in the sample, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas did not offer AFDC-UP prior to the Act. All states face the new requirement to guarantee child care for JOBS participants and to offer transitional child care and Medicaid to former AFDC recipients.

Competition for funds between JOBS and the other mandates of the Family Support Act is most evident in Texas. The Texas legislature, in making the first appropriation of expenditures for the Family Support Act, inserted the restriction that appropriations "may be expended only for mandated programs and services" of the Act. The mandates to provide AFDC-UP, transitional benefits, and child care for JOBS participants require new expenditures. In contrast, the education and training mandate in JOBS is to achieve a minimum participation rate and to target expenditures. If services from other programs can be obtained for JOBS participants, this mandate does not require new expenditures.

Spending for JOBS services in Texas is small relative to other expenditures for the Family Support Act's components. For 1991, Texas projects a total of $261.5 million of expenditures for components of the Act. Of this amount, $33.4 million is for AFDC-UP benefits, which are limited to six months, and $85.8 million is for Medicaid for AFDC-UP families. Transitional Medicaid and child care expenditures are projected to be $106.4 million. Child care for families participating in JOBS is estimated to cost $10.6 million. Expenditures for JOBS services and activities are projected to be $25.2 million. In summary, of the $261.5 million of state and federal funds projected for Family Support Act expenditures, only about 10 percent is for JOBS activities and services other than child care.

The other mandates in the Family Support Act also affected the course of JOBS implementation in Tennessee. The need to allocate money for AFDC-UP in the face of an already tight budget, as well as the potential for obtaining JOBS services without direct expenditures, were both factors explaining the state's low rate of spending on education, training, and employment services for JOBS.

Limitations on State Sources of Matching

The federal JOBS regulations limit the state funds that can be used to draw down the federal match to (a) funds appropriated directly to the state or local welfare agency or (b) funds transferred from another agency to the welfare agency and under its administrative control. This means, for example, that funds spent by an educational agency on services for JOBS participants cannot be claimed as part of a state's match, since the welfare agency does not control the funds. States around the country argued that this regulation discouraged other agencies, particularly educational agencies, from developing programs for JOBS participants. In December 1990, the federal government responded by permitting an alternative arrangement. In lieu of a formal transfer of funds from another agency to the welfare agency, the two agencies can negotiate a memorandum of understanding about the specific use of the funds.

During the period of this study, only two states, Pennsylvania and Texas, planned to use funds from agencies other than the Title IV-A agency to draw down federal JOBS funds. In state fiscal year 1991, Pennsylvania planned to obtain about one-third of the state match from other agencies. These funds are spent by the other agencies under the Single Point of Contact program, discussed below, and other state initiatives. The Texas Education Agency transferred $1 million appropriated for adult education to the Department of Human Services, which used the funds to draw down $1.7 million in federal funds.

Administrators in several states, including Maryland, New York, Oklahoma, and Tennessee, expect to be assisted by the federal guidelines designed to facilitate contributions from other state agencies. During late 1990, Tennessee was actively developing contractual arrangements that would enable it to use local United Way funds as the match for additional federal JOBS funds. The Tennessee welfare agency has also encouraged other state agencies to commit state funding for the non-federal matching share to help pay for JOBS services.

Discussion

Expenditures in the 10 states in the study are on average slightly lower than those in the rest of the country, although expenditures in some study states are considerably above the average. The 10 study states together drew down 43 percent of their entitlement of federal funds for 1991. Nationally, as shown in Table 4A, 48 percent of the

federal funds allotted for this period were claimed by the states. Four of the study states claimed more than 50 percent of their federal entitlement and two drew down less than 15 percent. Of the other 40 states, half claimed 50 percent or more of their federal entitlement, while none drew down less than 15 percent.

These levels of expenditures are a disappointment for individuals who expected the states to respond with the enthusiasm for JOBS expressed by its supporters at the time of passage of the Family Support Act. States are drawing on other resources to implement JOBS, as discussed in section IV, so that funding levels give only a partial picture of the extent of services for JOBS participants. But, in the words of one state administrator, "access to services is guaranteed only by JOBS financing." If welfare agencies can be certain of obtaining services for their clients only when they have the funds to purchase them, the lack of funding for JOBS is a source of concern.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND STAFFING OF JOBS

The federal JOBS legislation may pose a major administrative challenge to state welfare agencies, depending on their prior experience with welfare-to-work programs. Additionally, the federal legislation was presented as changing the focus of welfare programs from a financial support system to one promoting self-sufficiency through education and training services. Did implementing JOBS require any changes in organizational structure or management for the state agency or in the state agency's requirements for the organization and management of local welfare agencies? What initiatives did the state undertake to emphasize the changed focus of welfare programs within the state agency and to local agencies?

Responding to the JOBS legislation did not precipitate any significant internal organizational changes for the states included in this study, nor have the states chosen to devise major strategies to emphasize internally the changed focus of welfare programs. The low profile introduction of JOBS internally parallels its overall introduction within the states and stems from the fact that most of the states had already charted a course in keeping with the objectives of the federal legislation.

Under the WIN Demonstration program, states had the option of assuming full responsibility for the administration of employment and training programs for AFDC recipients. With the enactment of the Family Support Act, this arrangement became mandatory; that is, the state welfare agencies have full responsibility for administering JOBS, or for supervising its local administration. In responding to JOBS, state welfare agencies have the opportunity to provide internal leadership in changing the focus of welfare programs from a financial support system emphasizing fiscal accuracy to one promoting economic self-sufficiency through education and training services. Additionally, the changes called for by the federal legislation may require new or modified roles and responsibilities for the staff charged with the program's implementation. In fulfilling their new or modified responsibilities under the JOBS programs, front-line workers may require in-service training, particularly if they are expected to deliver a new message about the purpose of welfare programs and both the opportunities and obligations presented to clients under the JOBS program. In this section, we cover internal organizational changes in response to JOBS, staffing, and in-service training.

Intra-Organizational Response to JOBS

Responding to the JOBS legislation did not precipitate any significant internal organizational changes for the state welfare agencies included in this study. Any significant intra-organizational changes associated with introducing employment and training programs tended to precede JOBS when states introduced their WIN Demonstration programs. In at least two states, however, the JOBS legislation either accelerated or made more concrete the organizational changes already underway. The Texas Department of Human Services, in continuing its emphasis on

employment and training programs begun in 1987, reorganized along functional rather than program lines in 1989, just prior to the implementation of JOBS. The introduction of JOBS served to solidify this reorganization at the state level. In Mississippi, organizational changes begun prior to JOBS were made operational with its introduction. However, JOBS was not the critical factor behind either state's organizational restructuring.

The balance between state direction and local discretion has shifted to some degree in two states. This shift has been most significant in Oregon, where localities have been given substantially more authority and responsibility for meeting the JOBS objectives and participation rates than they held under Oregon's earlier welfare employment programs. But again, this shift to increased local authority and responsibility was begun prior to JOBS; JOBS accelerated the shift. State direction in New York increased as a direct result of the state's enabling legislation, which requires the local districts to offer all JOBS components. Previously, local districts could select which employment and training services to offer; only CWEP was a required service.

In most cases, the states are relying on field monitoring by state officials to oversee the local implementation of JOBS. Several states supplement this with statewide oversight committees and monitoring by case managers. Oklahoma is unique among the study states in having the capacity to conduct ongoing monitoring of program participation through its management information system. However, none of these quality control mechanisms appear to have been introduced especially for JOBS or to have changed in any significant fashion as a result of JOBS.

Unlike the major initiative undertaken in conjunction with implementing the Employment and Training Choices (ET) program in Massachusetts, none of the states in this study have chosen to devise major strategies in conjunction with JOBS to emphasize internally the changed focus of welfare programs or to change the reward structure for workers. Any initiatives that were undertaken occurred prior to implementing JOBS. Approaches to signaling an increased focus on promoting client self-sufficiency under JOBS have been limited, with states selectively using bulletins, memos, and consultants for specialized services and creating advisory boards composed of influential state people. Oregon created new job titles for four categories of frontline workers to signal the changes associated with JOBS for service coordination and case management. Some signaling has occurred through in-service training programs, which are discussed below.

In-Service Training

In preparing both managers and frontline staff to implement the JOBS program, all states have provided some in-service training to their personnel. Most of this training emphasized the regulatory and procedural changes associated with the state's JOBS program. States provided this training to all levels of staff in local offices through such methods as supervisor-worker training, workshops, and "train-the-trainer" strategies. Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, and Texas also provided special training for case managers. In Tennessee, county directors received in-service training on coordinating with other agencies and on marketing the JOBS program.

One strategy for emphasizing the changed focus of welfare programs as envisioned in the federal legislation is to introduce attitudinal and behavioral changes

through in-service training programs. In providing in-service training to staff, relatively little emphasis was given to changing staff attitudes among the states with well-developed welfare employment programs prior to JOBS. Changing staff attitudes may be unnecessary given these states' earlier experiences with welfare-to-work programs. The exception to this was Oregon, which emphasized the self-sufficiency opportunities that JOBS provided for clients. The emphasis on this theme was merited because it is in striking contrast to the emphasis given to obligations and sanctioning under Oregon's first welfare employment program. Those states with relatively less experience in operating welfare employment programs placed greater emphasis on staff attitudes and presented JOBS as an opportunity to promote clients' independence or as a mechanism for contributing to the economic development of the state.

Staff Roles and Responsibilities

Implementing JOBS has not resulted in any significant state initiatives or actions to change staff roles and responsibilities for frontline workers in local welfare agencies. In most states, the income maintenance workers are envisioned as having responsibility for informing clients about the JOBS program, determining their JOBS status, and making the appropriate referrals to the JOBS program. In general, these functions do not represent new responsibilities, however, because income maintenance workers fulfilled similar functions in earlier welfare employment programs. Case management services are performed by several types of front-line workers in varying organizations across the ten states. Because of the recognition given to case management in the federal legislation, the states' designs for case management services are presented in a separate section of this report.

Discussion

At this juncture in JOBS implementation, none of the internal organizational variables of signaling, staffing, training, or quality control appear to be of significant concern in state welfare agencies. In part, this may reflect the states' ability to draw on their experiences with earlier welfare employment programs in implementing JOBS, but it may also be that these organizational variables will represent areas requiring further investment as states gain additional experience with JOBS. Additionally, the functions of frontline workers may need to be reexamined if agencies wish to promote the JOBS program effectively as well as to individualize services to participants and their children. Although the findings suggest that new roles and responsibilities have not been created in most states as a result of JOBS, the federal law requires that clients be provided with information about JOBS at the time of application or recertification for eligibility. This suggests that the information-giving responsibilities of income maintenance workers may have increased. These workers also frequently fulfill gatekeeping or triage functions for the JOBS program. On this basis, increased attention to the roles and responsibilities of income maintenance workers may be merited as states begin to adjust their JOBS programs.

IV

STATE PROGRAM DESIGNS AND RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS

The significance of the Family Support Act rests in part on its requirement that states provide specific education, training and employment services to welfare recipients. The WIN program and subsequent amendments permitted states to offer a variety of employment and training services, and many chose to do so. But the federal government did not mandate any specific set of services, and the range of services available varied considerably both among and within the states.

Under JOBS, states must offer four specific services to recipients. States are required to provide educational activities, including basic and remedial education to achieve literacy, improve English proficiency, and achieve a high school or equivalent diploma. They must also offer job skills training, defined as vocational training in technical job skills or training in a specific occupational area. Job readiness activities to prepare participants for work are also required. Finally, states must provide job development and job placement, which consists of soliciting or discovering job openings, marketing participants, and securing job interviews for them (45 CFR 250.44).

In addition to these required services, states must elect to offer at least two out of four employment-related activities: group and individual job search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, and a community work experience program (CWEP) or an alternative work experience program. States have the option of offering post-secondary education and of providing supportive services for individuals engaged in "self-initiated" education and training (45 CFR 250.48).

An assessment of recipients' skills and employability must be performed to determine their needs for these services and for the child care and other supportive services that are required in order to participate. In designing their JOBS program, state welfare agencies must decide whether to base the choice and sequence of services solely on this assessment or to offer a particular set of services in a fixed sequence.

Although the Family Support Act imposes many new mandates on the states, leaving them with less discretion than they had under WIN or the amendments of the 1980s, they still have considerable flexibility in developing their JOBS programs. This section begins by describing the policies of the states regarding the design of their JOBS programs, including the flow of clients through program components. It then discusses the services that states have elected to include as JOBS components and compares them to the services available prior to the enact-

ment of JOBS. In practice, the design of JOBS depends on the amount of resources devoted to its component activities and services. The second half of this section describes how each state has allocated JOBS resources among program components and among the counties or welfare districts of the state.

SEQUENCE AND CHOICE OF SERVICES

Have states designed their JOBS programs to provide a set sequence of services, or are the services provided by JOBS tailored to individual abilities and needs? Are some services being emphasized over others?

In general, states have chosen an "assessment-based" design that does not specify a fixed sequence of services or emphasize one particular service over another. The sequence and choice of services is based on each participant's assessed abilities and needs. An exception is that some states refer job-ready participants to a particular set of employment services without a full assessment.

In designing a model of client flow, one critical decision facing a state is whether to track most participants through a fixed sequence of initial services or to assign them to services based on their assessed needs. Another decision is whether to emphasize some service or services over others. For example, a low-cost version of a fixed sequence program might refer all recipients to an initial period of job search, which would lead to employment for the most job-ready while reserving the more expensive education and training services for people who are not immediately employable. A high-cost version of a fixed sequence program might emphasize education, by first assessing recipients' educational attainment and referring them to the educational services needed to attain a certain level of proficiency. Only after their education needs were met would they be referred to training and employment services. (For examples of high- and low-cost programs, see Gueron and Pauly, 1991.)

An alternative to a fixed sequence approach is to make an initial assessment of each recipient's abilities, needs, and preferences, and base the referral to services on this assessment. The judgments of the agency staff, after consultation with the participant, determine the selection and sequence of services. Since no particular service is emphasized, the mix of low- and high-cost services will depend on the judgments of the agency staff and the availability of services. In this study, this approach is termed an "assessment-based" design.

In all study states, JOBS is best described as having an assessment-based design. According to the flow charts developed by the state welfare agencies, the model of client flow is quite similar across the states. All AFDC applicants and recipients receive an orientation to JOBS at the welfare agency. JOBS participants are then selected or volunteer according to the procedures described below in section IX, "Participation in JOBS: Mandatory versus Voluntary." The abilities and needs of participants are assessed and an employability plan is developed. They are then referred to one or more JOBS components based on the assessment.

At least half the states deviate from this model to some extent by referring people to an initial service, or a sequence of initial services, prior to completing a full assessment. Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Texas perform a partial assessment or screening that identifies individuals who are job-ready. People deemed job-ready are then tracked into job search and placement activities. New York, Oklahoma, and Oregon deviate from the assessment-based approach by permitting local offices to refer all recipients to job search for up to three weeks prior to the initial assessment, as allowed but not required by the federal legislation. After this brief

period of job search, recipients are assessed and referred to services based on this assessment.

As an example, the Texas Department of Human Services has specified a set of services to be provided to job-ready recipients, and has negotiated contracts with other organizations to deliver this service package. The package includes job readiness, job search, and job placement services. All AFDC recipients are subject to an initial screening, which separates the caseload into three Service Levels. Service Level I participants, who are individuals without significant barriers to employment and with either a high school education or recent work experience, are referred to the contractors. Service Level II participants, who are individuals without significant barriers to employment and with only nine to eleven years of education, are assessed and referred to services based on this assessment. Service Level III recipients, who have the greatest barriers to employment, are not assessed and receive no services.

The federal legislation requires that teenage parents who have not completed high school participate in an educational activity. For these participants, JOBS has some of the characteristics of a fixed sequence program, since teenage parents are to be referred to an education activity rather than services chosen through the standard assessment process. Minnesota's JOBS flow chart identifies teenage parents as a category distinct from other recipients and specifies that they attend school if this is appropriate. The flow charts of the other states do not indicate that teenage parents are to be treated differently from other parents.

In Oregon, JOBS is less clearly assessment-based, in the sense that specific programs with a sequence of activities have been developed for certain clients. The model program designed by the Oregon Human Resources Department for its seven full-service districts is the most prescribed program of any of the 10 states. An initial assessment is used to assign individuals to a "Placement Track" or an "Enhanced Employment and Training Track." The Placement Track, which is designed for individuals who possess basic and vocational skills, provides job search skills training. The Enhanced Employment and Training Track is designed to offer a detailed list of activities, including job readiness activities and basic academic skills. Basic academic skills encompass a range of competencies, from basic reading, writing, and math skills to high school completion or the attainment of the GED. A separate program is designed for young parents that provides the additional counseling, supportive services and monitoring needed by this group. Compared with the formal program designs in the other states, Oregon's places the greatest emphasis on basic education. Other states may in practice provide educational services to as many JOBS participants, but not as the result of an explicit design choice of the state welfare agency.

Discussion

Assessment-based programs are desirable if they promote referral to the services most needed by clients. When the full range of services is available, each participant can be assessed and referred to a set of services tailored to her unique needs. Assessment-based programs also have the advantage of giving the local agency flexibility to offer services that meet the needs of local labor markets and that draw upon the resources of the community.

However, an assessment-based design does not guarantee that participants will obtain the services that they need. When the availability of services is limited, an

assessment-based approach may mean that clients are in practice assessed as needing the services that are actually available. A potential advantage of a prescribed set and sequence of services is that it may assist in guaranteeing the availability of these services. Considering the low funding levels in some states, and the reliance of many states on the resources of other organizations, it is perhaps not surprising that they have chosen to implement programs that do not guarantee clients any particular set of services.

SERVICES SELECTED BY THE STATES

What education, training, and employment services are offered and how do they differ from the services available prior to JOBS?

All states offer the mandatory services and have elected to offer job search and on-the-job training. Michigan, Minnesota, and New York have also elected both work supplementation and CWEP, while Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania offer either work supplementation or CWEP. While most states offered some or all of these services prior to JOBS, JOBS permitted states to expand coverage to all parts of the state, serve more people, and increase the emphasis on education.

Prior to JOBS implementation, all states except Minnesota operated a WIN Demonstration program in at least some of their counties. All states except Mississippi and Tennessee operated one or more of the Title IV-A work programs, i.e. job search, work supplementation, and CWEP. The services offered by the welfare agencies as of October 1, 1988, just prior to passage of the Family Support Act, are shown in Table 5. Eight states offered job search, six offered work supplementation, and five offered CWEP, although not all of these programs were available statewide.

In addition to the services offered by the welfare agencies, AFDC recipients had access to services provided by other organizations. The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) is mandated to serve AFDC recipients on an "equitable basis," and was a source of services prior to JOBS, especially on-the-job training and classroom skills training. Educational institutions and other training organizations served AFDC recipients who met their criteria for service, as did the employment service. As a result, some AFDC recipients in some areas had access to all the services available under JOBS. A goal of JOBS is to improve the access of AFDC recipients to the services provided by these other organizations.

In implementing JOBS, Michigan, Minnesota, and New York have elected to offer all four of the employment-related activities, as seen in Table 6. Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania offer job search and on-the-job training and either work supplementation or CWEP. The other four states offer only job search and on-the-job training. Each of the states has also chosen to permit recipients to engage in post-secondary education, at least for two years.

The states in the sample have introduced few new types of employment and training services as a result of JOBS implementation. A comparison of Table 5 and Table 6 indicates that all states added on-the-job training to their list of program components and that Mississippi and Tennessee introduced job search. However, because AFDC recipients were eligible to receive on-the-job training from the JTPA prior to JOBS, the addition of on-the-job training to the list of program components may not have expanded the actual range of opportunities.

A list of some of the changes in the services offered, while not exhaustive, indicates the incremental nature of JOBS implementation. Maryland, for example,

had introduced a sizeable training program prior to JOBS, but did not offer remedial education for people under age 21. Participation in the training program was voluntary. JOBS has necessitated mandatory program participation, at least nominally, and more emphasis on education. In giving responsibility for the program to the JTPA, the state also decided to cease offering work supplementation and mandatory CWEP. In Michigan, the only new program component under JOBS is job readiness training. Because Minnesota emphasized education prior to JOBS, it is unclear whether JOBS has changed the mix of services. There has probably been an increase in the hours spent in GED and adult basic education in order to move closer to the 20-hour requirement and the increased availability of child care has probably expanded access to post-secondary education. In Mississippi, although responsibility for service delivery has been shifted to a different set of organizations, it is not yet clear that clients will have access to a different set of services.

TABLE 5: Characteristics of State Welfare Employment Programs as of October 1, 1988[1]

State	Geographic Scope Coverage	Counties	Date of WIN Demonstration	Mandatory[2] Yes/No	Required Participation Time
Maryland					
WIN Demonstration	Statewide		4/1/82	Yes	
Work Supplementation	Limited	8		No	
Job Search	Statewide			Yes	24 hours
1115 Waivers	(Two demonstration projects: Employment Initiatives and Grant Diversion for AFDC recipients)				
Michigan					
WIN Demonstration	Statewide		3/1/82	Yes	
CWEP	Statewide			Yes	
Work Supplementation	Limited	6		No	
Job Search	Statewide			Yes	Up to 8 weeks
1115 Waivers	(WIN Demonstration)				
Minnesota					
WIN	Limited	10		Yes	
CWEP	Limited	7		Yes	
Work Supplementation	Limited	11		No	
Job Search	(3)			Yes	3 days
1115 Waivers	(Self-Employment Investment Demonstration, serving 8 counties)				
Mississippi					
WIN Demonstration[4]	Limited	6		Yes	
New York					
WIN Demonstration	(3)		5/1/85	Yes	
CWEP	Statewide			Yes	
Work Supplementation	Limited	36		No	
Job Search	(3)			Yes	8 weeks/year
1115 Waivers	(Two projects: AFDC/TEAP and Shared Housing Demonstration)				
Oklahoma					
WIN Demonstration	Statewide		1/1/82	Yes	
CWEP	Statewide			Yes	
Work Supplementation	Statewide			No	
Job Search	Statewide			Yes	Up to 320 hours/year
1115 Waivers	(Assistance Payments-Work Incentive Program Waiver for Registration, for mothers with children under 6)				

New York now requires its counties to offer all JOBS components and expects more emphasis on education and less on CWEP. Michigan also expects more participants to go into education and fewer into CWEP. In Oklahoma, JOBS did not require significant design changes; however, administrators have the perception that a greater emphasis is being placed on educational components. Oregon and Pennsylvania had programs in place whose designs were consistent with JOBS and have not made major programmatic changes. Tennessee expects that the program will be more systematic, with a generally uniform pattern of organizational relationships throughout the state. The range of services offered is similar to the pre-JOBS array, although there is more emphasis on remedial education and on self-initiated post-secondary education. In Texas, the range of services is also similar, and again there is expected to be a greater emphasis on education.

Looking across the states, it is apparent that the choice of employment and training services is related to the division of responsibility among the organizations delivering JOBS services. Work supplementation and CWEP are designed around the welfare grant; the grant is diverted to an employer under work supplementation and the grant determines the number of hours of work under CWEP. The welfare agency can administer these services more easily than other organiza-

TABLE 5: Characteristics of State Welfare Employment Programs as of October 1, 1988[1] (continued)

State	Geographic Scope Coverage	Counties	Date of WIN Demonstration	Mandatory[2] Yes/No	Required Participation Time
Oregon					
WIN Demonstration	Statewide		1/1/82	Yes	
Work Supplementation	Statewide			No	
Job Search	Statewide			Yes	Up to 45 days
1115 Waivers	(JOBS and New JOBS)				
Pennsylvania					
WIN Demonstration	Statewide		NA	Yes	
CWEP	Statewide			Yes	
Job Search	Statewide			Yes	Up to 8 weeks/year
Tennessee					
WIN Demonstration	Limited	2	10/2/85	No	
Texas					
WIN Demonstration	Statewide		4/1/83	Yes	
Job Search	Statewide			Yes	Up to 30 days
1115 Waivers	(AFDC Fraud Control Project)				

1 The programs reported here are those identified in the individual State Plans for Administration of Title IV-A of the Social Security Act.
2 Participation was required of all nonexempt individuals. Exempt individuals may volunteer.
3 Program was in effect in the state, but coverage was not specified.
4 A WIN Demonstration was introduced after October 1, 1988.

Definitions:
WIN — Work Incentive Program
CWEP — Community Work Experience Program

Source:
Characteristics of State Plans for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, 1989 Edition, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

tions, since it has direct control over the grant. Job search and on-the-job training, in contrast, do not depend on the amount of the welfare grant.

In the states where organizations other than the welfare agency have a major responsibility for operating the program, CWEP and work supplementation are less likely to be offered. The two states in which the JTPA operates JOBS, Maryland and Tennessee, do not offer CWEP or work supplementation. Mississippi, in which the community action agencies operate JOBS, does not offer work supplementation and offers an alternate work experience program where the hours of work do not depend on the amount of the welfare grant. The Texas welfare agency traditionally provides few services directly and is relying on a wide variety of other organizations to deliver JOBS services. Given its use of contractors and the

TABLE 6: JOBS Services and Activities Selected by States

State	Elective	Optional
Maryland	Job Search On-the-Job Training	Post-Secondary Education Alternative Work Experience Self-Initiated Education and Training Other Activities
Michigan	Job Search On-the-Job Training Work Supplementation CWEP	Self-Initiated Education and Training
Minnesota	Job Search On-the-Job Training Work Supplementation CWEP	Post-Secondary Education Self-Initiated Education and Training Other Activities
Mississippi	Job Search On-the-Job Training	Post-Secondary Education Alternative Work Experience Self-Initiated Education and Training Other Activities
New York	Job Search On-the-Job Training Work Supplementation CWEP	Post-Secondary Education Self-Initiated Education and Training Other Activities
Oklahoma	Job Search On-the-Job Training Work Supplementation	Post-Secondary Education Alternative Work Experience Self-Initiated Education and Training Other Activities
Oregon	Job Search On-the-Job Training Work Supplementation	Alternative Work Experience Self-Initiated Education and Training Other Activities
Pennsylvania	Job Search On-the-Job Training CWEP	Post-Secondary Education Alternative Work Experience Self-Initiated Education and Training
Tennessee	Job Search On-the-Job Training	Post-Secondary Education Self-Initiated Education and Training
Texas	Job Search On-the-Job Training	Post-Secondary Education Self-Initiated Education and Training

JTPA, it is not surprising that it does not offer work supplementation or CWEP. Pennsylvania, whose SPOC program is contracted through the JTPA Service Delivery Areas, offers CWEP but not work supplementation.

Discussion

In summary, states have responded to JOBS by making incremental changes in the design of their welfare employment programs. For many states, the mandate to perform an initial assessment and to offer a variety of educational services has required new procedures and a change in emphasis. In contrast, the mandate to provide two of the four elective employment-related activities has resulted in few new types of services in most states.

The important change is not the introduction of new types of services, but rather the extension of program coverage to more jurisdictions and individuals and the emphasis on education. Faced with federally mandated participation rates and the necessity for statewide operation by 1992, states have given priority to expanding the scope of the program. They have extended program coverage to more jurisdictions, making the availability of services more uniform across the state, and they generally plan to serve more individuals. In doing so, many states are relying on the types of services already in place and on an assessment-based design that can access these services for recipients.

JOBS EXPENDITURES ON PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Which services and activities are being financed with JOBS funds? How are states allocating their JOBS funds among components of the program?

States expect to spend their JOBS funds in very different ways. Most states that implemented JOBS early are spending significant amounts on education and/or training. Those that delayed implementation are devoting a large share of their resources to the client processing tasks of assessment, employability planning, and case management.

The states' expectations about how their JOBS funds will be spent reflect many implementation choices. Table 7 contains their projections of the distribution of JOBS expenditures among components of the program in federal fiscal year 1991. The table includes only expenditures for the JOBS components financed at the enhanced federal matching rate and excludes expenditures for child care, other supportive services, and administrative costs.

These estimates, which were generally provided by state administrators, are based on various sources of information. A few states have the capacity to track expenditures by service component and could make projections for 1991. But for many states, these estimates are based on legislative appropriations, state agency allocation decisions, local plans, or contracts negotiated with providers. Because case managers are frequently responsible for performing the assessment and developing the employability plan, several states combine their expenditures on these functions and list them all as either assessment and employability plan development or as case management. In at least one state, the estimates are based on information about the distribution of participants across services, rather than on the expenditures for services.

States have made very different choices in spending their JOBS funds. All states except Oklahoma and Oregon are devoting significant shares of their funds to assessment, employability plan development, and case management. Minne-

sota, Mississippi, and Texas devote particularly large shares of their funds to these functions. Mississippi uses almost two-fifths of its JOBS expenditures for case management, while Minnesota and Texas use one-half or more of their funds for this purpose. In Minnesota, case management services are viewed as a central component of the program. In Texas, case management is almost the only component of the program for participants in the Service Level II category. In contrast, Oregon has allocated only small amounts for these services, although it uses job readiness activities to perform ongoing assessments of client's abilities and needs. Oregon's program of job readiness activities is absorbing 58 percent of the state's JOBS expenditures. Oklahoma has also allocated small amounts to these initial services, which are performed by the staff responsible for income maintenance.

Some states are making substantial expenditures on high-cost services designed to increase earning capacity, including basic and secondary education, post-secondary education, job skills training, and vocational education. Maryland, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania have allocated 20 percent or more of their JOBS funds for education. Michigan is spending 35 percent of its JOBS funds on education and self-initiated education and training, which includes post-secondary education. Maryland, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania are spending 25 percent or more of their JOBS funds for jobs skills training and vocational education. These states implemented JOBS in 1989 and are spending relatively large amounts on the program.

TABLE 7: Expected Allocation of Funds for JOBS Services (Excluding Supportive Services and Child Care) Federal Fiscal Year 1991

	Maryland[1]	Michigan	Minnesota[4]	Mississippi	New York
Assessment and employability plan development	$5,516,546[2]	$4,602,224[2]	$1,378,811	NA[7]	$7,500,000
Case management	NA[2]	NA[2]	5,685,550[5]	$850,407[6,7]	2,000,000
Education	4,845,805	3,746,600	571,399	262,000	2,400,000
Post-secondary education	385,387	0	538,745	0	1,700,000
Job readiness activities	3,012,621	74,813	286,199	NA[7]	5,100,000
Job skills training / vocational education	5,392,517	3,469,017	4,751,674[5]	352,133	2,200,000
Job development and job placement	NA[3]	402,709	NA[5]	763,800[7]	1,100,000
Job search	781,531	3,045,766	997,818	NA[7]	14,100,000[8]
Work experience	NA[3]	1,127,310	24,163[5]	0	3,000,000
On-the-job-training	272,005	98,671	76,395	0	800,000
Work supplementation	0	0	13,184	0	600,000
Self-initiated education and training	0	3,500,110	0	0	2,400,000
Other work, education or training	1,373,786[3]	0	0	0	15,400,000
Other costs matched at the Medicaid rate	0	735,569	0	0	0

Most of the states that implemented JOBS in October 1990 are not yet devoting large amounts of funds to education or training services. It is noteworthy that Mississippi and Texas, which are spending very limited amounts on services, have acknowledged the emphasis on education in the Family Support Act by using some of their very limited funds for adult education. The $1 million appropriation for education by the Texas legislature, which was matched by $1.7 in federal

TABLE 7: Expected Allocation of Funds for JOBS Services (Excluding Supportive Services and Child Care) Federal Fiscal Year 1991 (continued)

	Oklahoma	Oregon[9]	Pennsylvania	Tennessee	Texas
Assessment and employability plan development	$275,000	$80,957	$1,290,545[12]	$253,125	NA[14]
Case management	0	701,348[10]	NA[13]	22,540	$14,100,000[14]
Education	2,000,000	834,468	6,695,126	0	2,740,000
Post-secondary education	0	0	931,073	0	0
Job readiness activities	560,000	6,541,700	3,427,887	0	0
Job skills training / vocational education	167,525	172,457	12,452,392	0	0
Job development and job placement	550,000	69,158	NA[13]	0	0
Job search	837,627	1,768,100	3,940,373	0	5,300,000
Work experience	1,225,000	151,987	976,325	0	0
On-the-job-training	25,000	0	270,384	0	0
Work supplementation	60,000	0	0	0	0
Self-initiated education and training	0	0	NA[13]	0	0
Other work, education or training	325,000	289,639	452,336	0	0
Other costs matched at the Medicaid rate	0	715,885[11]	0	0	0

NA Funds are not allocated to this category separately.

1 Actual expenditures for January 1, 1990 to November 30, 1990.
2 Expenditures for assessment and employability plan development include expenditures for case management.
3 Expenditures for other activities include expenditures for job development and placement and work experience programs.
4 Actual expenditures for October 1, 1989 to September 30, 1990. Includes transportation and other work-related supportive services and administrative costs.
5 Expenditures for case management include some expenditures for classroom training, work experience, and job placement activities.
6 Estimated from amounts budgeted for October 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.
7 Funds allocated to case management include assessment and employability plan development, job readiness activities, job development and job placement, and job search when performed by a case manager.
8 Includes expenditures for services performed by the Job Service, such as job search, job development and placement, and other activities.
9 Estimates are for October 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991. Includes expenditures for participants in the Enhanced and Basic Programs.
10 Case management for teenagers.
11 Includes $715,885 for start-up costs.
12 Expenditures for assessment and employability plan development are counted twice, here and as a component of expenditures for other services.
13 Expenditures for these services are included in expenditures for other service components.
14 Includes other functions such as outreach, orientation, assessment, employment development planning, conciliation, and determination of good cause.

funds, was the only increase in funding for JOBS services resulting from JOBS implementation.

Expenditures on low-cost services, including job search, work experience, on-the-job training and work supplementation, are quite limited in many states. Work experience and work supplementation do not require large expenditures, and on-the-job training is generally contributed by the JTPA. The exception is job search, which is receiving substantial amounts in selected states. However, in some states, expenditures listed as job search in fact support additional activities. The large amount for job search in New York represents funds transferred to the Department of Labor for a range of services in addition to job search, including job development and placement. In Texas, all the funds used for the contracts for Service Level I recipients are listed as job search, although contractors may provide some additional services including low-intensity case management, job readiness activities, and job placement.

Discussion

Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania, with relatively generous resources and experience in operating welfare employment programs, are using these resources to obtain education and training opportunities for JOBS clients. But states with less generous resources are using them more strategically to meet the federal participation mandates. In the absence of enough funds to purchase services, Mississippi and Texas are funding case managers who are expected to refer JOBS participants to other programs. The *Direct Delivery Handbook* of the Texas Department of Human Services states explicitly that the case manager is to "help clients tap their own and other resources that will help them achieve case goals." The welfare agency is depending on other organizations to provide the education and training services for JOBS participants.

Perhaps the main lesson to be drawn from Table 7 is that resources other than JOBS funds are helping to support the program. This is most clear for Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, which are spending small amounts of funds, or no funds, on some or all of their JOBS services. These state welfare agencies are clearly counting on the services of other organizations to implement the program. While this is less obvious in other states, most of their welfare agencies are also implementing JOBS with the expectation that other organizations will contribute their resources to JOBS participants. Arrangements for accessing the resources of other organizations for JOBS participants is discussed in section V.

PLANNED INTRASTATE VARIATION IN PROGRAM DESIGN AND RESOURCES

Are JOBS programs designed to vary among the local welfare offices in each state? How are JOBS funds allocated among the local offices?

State welfare agencies have designed their JOBS programs to be uniform across the state, but differences are expected due to variations in local conditions. In all states except New York, Oklahoma and Pennsylvania, funds are allocated to local welfare offices based on their caseloads and are not expected to be a source of variation in JOBS implementation.

Although JOBS must be implemented statewide by 1992, the program need not be uniform in all jurisdictions. The extent of intrastate variation is an important issue to be addressed in studying JOBS implementation and will be examined ex-

tensively in the local-level research. In examining state decisions, the main issue is whether there is planned variation in the state-level program design.

No state welfare agencies appear to have built specific regional variation into the design of their JOBS program. Some of them, however, permit or encourage variation by delegating responsibilities to local offices. Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Oregon give local welfare offices considerable formal authority to design their own programs. Local discretion is to be expected in Minnesota and New York, where public assistance is administered by the counties. Minnesota requires that certain elements of STRIDE be uniform across the state, but permits each county to design its own program within these parameters. In New York, JOBS implementation has meant a significant reduction in the wide discretion previously given to counties, which are now required to offer all mandatory and elective JOBS services. But state regulations specify that counties, "should be given maximum flexibility... to meet local needs," and programs are expected to vary from one county to another.

In Michigan, where public assistance is state-administered, local offices developed their own plans for the programs operating prior to JOBS. They continue to develop their own plans and considerable diversity is anticipated. In Oregon, decentralized planning is new with JOBS and is viewed as a desirable means of adjusting for varying labor markets and client needs.

In Maryland, the other state where public assistance is administered by the counties, JOBS services are primarily the responsibility of the Department of Employment and Economic Development, working through the local JTPA Service Delivery Areas. In contrast to Minnesota and New York, the state-level organizations with primary responsibility for JOBS in Maryland make a strong effort to assure a uniform model of service administration. Hence, the evidence to date indicates that states that administer public assistance may not have more uniform designs for their JOBS program than states in which the counties administer public assistance. Whether the locus of administrative authority influences the uniformity of program design will be explored further in the local-level research.

Even when a state intends that the model of service delivery be uniform within the state, intrastate variations could be expected due to factors such as differences in funding, in the number and capacity of service providers, interagency relationships, labor markets, and the needs of the clients. Intrastate variation can also be expected when direct responsibility for providing JOBS services is transferred from the welfare agency to other local agencies, such as the SDAs and community action agencies, or where private contractors are the primary providers.

Geographic differences in funding levels within the states are not expected to be a major source of variation in the majority of states. Most states allocate funds to local welfare offices or counties based on the AFDC caseload or the number of people required to participate in JOBS. The distribution of funds among localities has been an issue only in Pennsylvania, which operates a "low intensity" New Directions track and a "high intensity" Single Point of Contact (SPOC) track. Caseloads are the basis for the distribution of funds for New Directions and, over the long-run, for SPOC as well. But prior to JOBS, funds for SPOC were distributed according to the scope of local programs rather than caseloads. Of the state's two major urban areas, the Pittsburgh area mounted a more ambitious SPOC program than Philadelphia and received considerably more SPOC funds per AFDC

case. When JOBS was implemented, funding limitations made it unfeasible to "level up" Philadelphia's allocation to that of the Pittsburgh area. A reluctance of state officials to penalize localities that undertook ambitious programs, and state political dynamics, made it unfeasible to "level down" the allocation of the Pittsburgh area. In 1990, the resulting disparities were large and reducing them had become one of the most important items on the state-level JOBS agenda.

Two states, New York and Oklahoma, do not make an initial allocation of funds to local agencies but instead allocate funds based on the local agencies' levels of activity. This approach, in which funding follows rather than precedes local activity, does not appear to have slowed the pace of JOBS implementation in Oklahoma or produced problematic variations among counties. The state establishes goals that its local offices must meet and monitors them closely, and the funding mechanism assists rather than hinders this state control.

In New York State, the decision to allocate funds to counties based on their level of activity stems from a different set of factors. New York's counties administer public assistance and finance approximately half of the non-federal share of costs. Counties initiate expenditures and submit claims to the state to receive federal and state reimbursement. The decision to use this approach for JOBS, and not give counties an initial allocation of funds, is consistent with standard practice in New York. Nonetheless, it is viewed by welfare advocates in the state as a significant policy decision in light of the fiscal strains facing many counties. Advocates argue that some counties will make greater efforts than others, and the overall pace of JOBS implementation will be slowed, when "the local dollar of expenditures is the first dollar."

New York is the only study state in which the localities finance a share of the cost of JOBS. In the other states with county-administered public assistance programs, Maryland and Minnesota, the state pays the full cost of JOBS. Maryland awards funds to each JTPA Service Delivery Area based on its caseloads. Minnesota makes two allocations to counties. An Employment and Training Block Grant, requiring no local match, finances all services except case management. Case management is financed by a separate allocation, which required a county match of 25 percent until January 1991, when the state assumed the county share. Both allocations are based primarily on caseloads, with greater weight given to cases in the target groups.

Discussion

A premise of this project is that the operation of JOBS must be examined at the local level, where front-line workers deliver the components of the program. The next phase of the project studies three local welfare offices within each state to determine how JOBS is being implemented and the degree of variation within each state. The research reported here indicates that if JOBS varies among the local offices, as expected, the variation will be due to local factors rather than an explicit state design.

V

ACCESSING SERVICES FOR JOBS PARTICIPANTS

The Family Support Act gives state welfare agencies several options for obtaining the services that are delivered through the JOBS program. Welfare agencies can provide the services directly, purchase them from other organizations, or obtain them from other organizations without payment. The need to obtain services without payment stems from funding constraints and from the provision in the Act that JOBS funds can only be used to purchase services that are "not otherwise available on a nonreimbursable basis."

This section begins by discussing the most important contracts and agreements that welfare agencies have negotiated to purchase services from other organizations. Some state welfare agencies have contracted out many or all JOBS services, while others have chosen to provide more services directly. The arrangements that state welfare agencies have made to obtain resources from other agencies on a non-reimbursable basis, or without payment, are then outlined.

Of the agencies that serve JOBS participants, the Job Training Partnership Act and educational agencies are particularly important in most states. This section describes the linkages that have been developed between the state welfare agency and the JTPA organizations. In many states, the JTPA organizations are paid contractors to the welfare agency. In all states, to a greater or lesser degree, the JTPA also serves JOBS clients with its own funds, i.e. on a non-reimbursable basis. The section ends by discussing how welfare agencies access the educational services that are provided as JOBS components and how the role of education in welfare employment programs has changed as a result of JOBS implementation.

INTERAGENCY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONTRACTING FOR SERVICES

How are the activities of the welfare agency coordinated with those of other agencies? To what extent does the state welfare agency contract with other agencies for JOBS services?

Although responsibility for administering JOBS is lodged with the welfare agency, various agencies serve JOBS participants. In all states, the welfare agency involved other agencies in planning for JOBS.

All states except Oklahoma contract with other agencies to provide a substantial share of JOBS services. The JTPA is the sole state contractor in Maryland and Tennessee. State or local welfare agencies in all other states except Mississippi and Oklahoma contract with the JTPA for selected services or in selected localities. Some state welfare agencies have contracted with a small number of provider organizations, while the Michigan state welfare agency and local New York agencies have negotiated contracts with a great variety of state and local agencies.

Under WIN, responsibility for administering employment and training programs for AFDC recipients was shared jointly by the welfare agency and the employment security agency. Beginning in 1981, states had the option of operating a WIN Demonstration program in which the welfare agency would assume full responsibility for program administration. The Family Support Act mandates this institutional arrangement, giving the state welfare agency full responsibility for administering JOBS or, where public assistance is administered locally, for supervising its administration.

In assuming this responsibility, welfare agencies continue to rely on the capacity of other organizations to deliver education, training, and employment services. For these organizations — educational agencies, the JTPA, the employment security agency, and others — the delivery of education, training and employment services is their primary purpose. For this reason, welfare agencies naturally look to them for the capacity and expertise to deliver JOBS services.

The Family Support Act recognizes the role of other agencies by requiring that the governor coordinate the activities under JOBS with other relevant employment, training, and education programs in the state. Some specific mechanisms for achieving coordination are mandated. The state JOBS plan must be submitted to the State Job Training Coordinating Council, which assists the governor in setting policy for the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program. In addition, the state welfare agency must consult with the state education agency and the agency responsible for administering the JTPA to promote coordination in the planning and delivery of services. Because the linkages with the JTPA and education agencies are particularly important, they are discussed individually later in this section.

Interagency Planning

Interagency planning for JOBS implementation, a first step in interagency coordination, occurred in all ten states. In some states, such as Michigan and Pennsylvania, JOBS is part of a broader interagency effort that was already underway to improve the education and skills of the population. In Pennsylvania, the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) Program was created in 1987 through the cooperative efforts of four agencies: the welfare agency, the JTPA, the employment security agency, and the education agency. When New Directions was implemented in 1989, SPOC became the high-intensity track of a two-track program. Michigan had created the Michigan Human Investment Fund Board, which was attempting to integrate all education and training programs in the state into the Michigan Opportunity System. Agencies in these states had considerable experience in joint planning prior to JOBS and continued to plan together for JOBS implementation.

Minnesota had also launched an interagency effort prior to JOBS to increase the economic independence of the disadvantaged and unemployed, creating a Department of Jobs and Training to link employment and training programs with welfare, education, economic development, and related activities. These linkages were well established when the state began preparing for JOBS and joint planning had become routine.

In Maryland and Oklahoma, the governor played a particularly prominent role in bringing agencies together into an effective planning process. In Maryland, the Governor's Employment and Training Council for the JTPA took primary responsibility for developing the policies and procedures for Project Independence (PI). The council is composed of representatives from the state and local agencies operating PI,

providing strong linkage among these organizations through an arm of the governor, William Donald Schaefer. This arrangement has enabled the governor to exert considerable control over the program, which is noteworthy because Maryland operates a state-supervised, locally administered public assistance program.

In Oklahoma, Governor Henry Bellmon called for the development of an interagency agreement to assure that JOBS would be closely integrated with other employment, training, and educational programs. This led to the creation of a JOBS Interagency Task Force, which undertook the planning to implement the program. Partly as a result of the governor's call for agreement and the work of the task force, the welfare agency in Oklahoma obtains services from all other state agencies without payment, or on a non-reimbursable basis.

Interagency cooperation is the basis for JOBS implementation in Tennessee, where most of the resources are provided by the JTPA. Administrators of the state welfare agency and the labor department, which administers the JTPA, worked closely to develop the precursor to JOBS, in which JTPA funds were used to provide employment and training services for AFDC recipients. When legislative appropriations for JOBS services were not forthcoming, they decided that JTPA funds would be the primary source of services. Once the two departments had reached this agreement, a JOBS Advisory Council was created to involve other state agencies that could contribute to the achievement of JOBS objectives. As might be expected, the tightest link in the planning process is between the welfare and labor departments, which has been described as a marriage.

In both New York and Oregon, many state agencies were brought into the planning process. Oregon's Welfare Reform Steering Committee, which included representatives of recipients, labor, and business as well as government agencies, made the major policy decisions needed to begin JOBS. New York established several interagency groups to advise the drafters of the JOBS legislation and to assist in planning for JOBS. Because public assistance is administered by the counties in New York, few commitments were made by the state agencies. The task of negotiating most formal agreements was left to the counties, which must engage in their own local planning process.

Other states, such as Mississippi and Texas, had less experience with interagency planning, and JOBS encouraged new interactions. New interagency relationships were required in Mississippi, where, just prior to JOBS implementation, the governor created a new Department of Human Services through the consolidation of several state agencies. The Welfare Reform Interagency Council, which he appointed to discuss JOBS and welfare reform in general, was a vehicle for establishing relationships between the Department and other state agencies. Texas created two interagency groups to plan for JOBS, a State Agency Executive Committee and an Interagency Planning Group, made up of mid-level managers of the relevant agencies. In both Mississippi and Texas, the argument has been made that planning for JOBS was performed primarily by the welfare agency, and that the most significant accomplishment of these interagency efforts was the introduction of a planning process to be used in the future.

Contracting for Services

Because few welfare agencies have the capacity to deliver education, training, and employment services, a large share of JOBS funds are used by welfare agencies to purchase services from other organizations. Most agencies rely heavily on

contracts or agreements with other governmental agencies or, to a lesser degree, with private or non-profit organizations. In the 10 study states, several patterns of contracting are evident.

Welfare agencies in two states, Maryland and Tennessee, have transferred almost all of the operational responsibility for JOBS to the state JTPA agency. In both states, all funds for JOBS education, training, and employment services have been transferred to the JTPA, as well as responsibility for meeting the federal participation and targeting mandates. The JTPA, through its local Service Delivery Areas (SDAs), secures all employment and training services for participants. The SDAs also have responsibility for performing assessments, developing the employability plans, and arranging for and referring participants to all JOBS services.

Although the transfer of responsibility is similar in these two states, the transfer of resources is quite different. Maryland in effect purchases services from the JTPA using JOBS funds. Tennessee, in contrast, contracted with the state JTPA agency in order to draw upon the resources of the JTPA. The state legislature, facing inadequate tax revenues, appropriated no funds for education, training, or employment services for JOBS participants. Under the contract between the welfare agency and the state JTPA agency, the welfare agency transfers its funds for child care and other supportive services to the JTPA. In exchange, all education, training, and employment services for JOBS participants are to be provided by local Service Delivery Areas with JTPA funding.

In Pennsylvania, JOBS relies heavily on interagency cooperation and sharing of responsibility. Most JOBS expenditures are made through the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) program, which is a cooperative arrangement among the welfare agency, the JTPA, the employment service, and the education agency. A task force composed of staff from these agencies has primary policy and management responsibilities. While SPOC contracts through the JTPA Service Delivery Areas, the JTPA is an equal partner with the other agencies.

The Minnesota welfare agency also has a close working relationship with the state employment and training agency. Under a negotiated agreement between the two agencies, the state employment and training agency assists in the management of STRIDE by overseeing the local employment and training service providers. These local providers are chosen by the counties and are under contract to the counties, but they must be certified by the state agency. By requiring counties to contract with certified employment and training providers, a majority of which are also JTPA providers, the state built STRIDE on the existing employment and training network.

In three states, the state welfare agency has contracted with both state and local agencies. The Mississippi welfare agency contracts with the state education agency for adult education programs and with the community action agency in each region for case management. Texas is contracting for $2.74 million in adult education services through the state education agency. Texas is also spending about $5.3 million for services for its most job-ready clients, those in Service Level I, through 13 contracts negotiated with local providers under a competitive bidding process. A private for-profit firm, Maximus, won contracts in the largest urban areas, which together account for close to half of all AFDC cases in the counties operating JOBS. Michigan spends a large proportion of its JOBS funds through a great many contracts negotiated at the local level with state and local organizations.

Oregon spends about three-quarters of its JOBS funds through contracts with local organizations. The state welfare agency negotiated a prime contract in each local district with either the JTPA Service Delivery Area or the community college, which in turn subcontracts with other local organizations. The JTPA is the prime contractor in 9 of the state's 15 local districts, the community college in the remaining 6 districts.

The state welfare agencies in New York and Oklahoma rely less heavily on contracts than the other states, although for different reasons. Because JOBS is administered by the counties in New York, the state welfare agency does not in general contract directly for services, leaving this to the counties, which contract with a great variety of organizations. A major exception is a demonstration program operated by public and private contractors that provides intensive case management and other services to small groups of volunteers. In addition, the state continues to transfer funds to the Department of Labor for job placement services, as it did under WIN, and is providing some support for educational activities. Oklahoma is a sharp contrast to the other states, using less than 3 percent of its funds to purchase education, employment, and training services. Virtually all services are obtained on a non-reimbursable basis under agreements negotiated between the welfare agency and other state and local agencies.

Discussion

The Family Support Act gives state welfare agencies full responsibility for administering JOBS. But this mandate and the mandate to coordinate with service providers are potentially in conflict. If other agencies are given responsibility, the administrative control of the welfare agency is weakened. In reviewing state JOBS plans, the Department of Health and Human Services expressed concern that the welfare agencies in four states did not exert sufficient authority over JOBS. State administrators, in contrast, view their strong interagency relationships as necessary to the success of the program.

The practice of contracting for services also helps explain why states are experiencing delays and difficulty in reporting on the distribution of expenditures among JOBS components as requested by the federal government. Most states write contracts or allocate funds for a program or for a set of services, rather than for specific components. Tracking expenditures on specific components requires the collection of information that may not be generated in the course of program operations.

OBTAINING RESOURCES ON A NON-REIMBURSABLE BASIS

To what extent are education, training, and employment services being obtained for JOBS participants on a "non-reimbursable basis," i.e., funded from sources other than JOBS?

In all states, JOBS participants are being served by education, training, and employment programs other than those funded by JOBS. Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas are relying on other programs for a large share of the services for JOBS participants. While other states cannot estimate the value of services obtained on a non-reimbursable basis, they are implementing JOBS with the expectation that significant amounts of resources will be drawn from other organizations.

Under the Family Support Act, states are expected to secure services for JOBS clients in two ways: by purchasing them with JOBS funds and by obtaining them

from other programs without payment. The need to obtain services from other organizations without payment stems not only from funding constraints, but also from the provision in the Act that specifies that JOBS funds can only be used to purchase services or activities that are "not otherwise available on a nonreimbursable basis" (42 U.S.C. 685(b)). This provision is designed to encourage the maintenance of effort by organizations that are already serving AFDC recipients.

According to the federal regulations, services that are available on a non-reimbursable basis are those that governments make available to most eligible residents or to the low-income population. For example, state laws guarantee all children access to primary and secondary education without regard to the availability of funding. This means that JOBS funds cannot be used to pay for a standard high school education, since it is available without payment. The Family Support Act envisions that resources from other programs will be obtained through interagency "coordination." The responsibility for coordination is given to the Governor, who must assure that JOBS is coordinated with the JTPA and other relevant employment, training, and education programs available in the state.

Significant resources for JOBS participants are being obtained from other agencies through coordination. As is discussed in more detail below, the JTPA and educational agencies are important sources of services in all states. But to go beyond this generalization is difficult. In the majority of states, it is not possible to estimate the share of services being purchased with JOBS funds, compared to the share being obtained on a non-reimbursable basis. This inability stems in part from the difficulty of estimating the value of services obtained without payment. In addition, state and local welfare agencies often have no way of ascertaining the extent of the resources being obtained from other service providers.

In three states, the approximate share of services being obtained on a non-reimbursable basis is fairly clear. As Table 7 makes clear, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas are expecting to obtain most education, employment, and training services from other agencies without payment. Tennessee and Mississippi, which are spending modest amounts of JOBS funds, have entered into formal agreements with other state agencies to obtain services on a non-reimbursable basis. The Tennessee Departments of Human Services and Labor have negotiated a contract under which the Department of Labor agrees to provide all services except child care to JOBS clients using JTPA funds. The Mississippi Department of Human Services has negotiated memoranda of understanding with many agencies, including the Department of Education, JTPA Service Delivery Areas, the Employment Security Commission, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Unlike Tennessee, the agreements in Mississippi do not specify the number of people to be served, and administrators cannot be confident that services will be made available. But Mississippi is contracting for few services other than case management and a small amount for adult education, so that services will be provided on a non-reimbursable basis to the extent that they are provided at all.

Texas is spending modest amounts of JOBS funds and is relying heavily on other agencies for services. However, the state-level interagency planning process is not well developed, and the Texas Department of Human Services has not negotiated agreements with other agencies for services on a non-reimbursable basis. While the department is dependent on resources from other agencies, it is unclear to what extent these services will be forthcoming, especially in view of the decline in federal funding for the JTPA program in Texas.

In Pennsylvania and Oklahoma, it is possible to infer how resources from other agencies are supplementing JOBS expenditures. Pennsylvania has a two-track system that concentrates JOBS funds on the high-intensity Single Point of Contact program. According to state policy, all education and training services for clients following the low-intensity New Directions track are being obtained on a non-reimbursable basis from a variety of organizations under various arrangements. Oklahoma uses less than 3 percent of its JOBS funds to purchase education, training, and employment services. The state's Department of Human Services has negotiated agreements with numerous agencies for services on a non-reimbursable basis, including the state's Department of Education, the Employment Security Commission, the Department of Vocational and Technical Education, the 12 Service Delivery Areas of the JTPA, the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma, and the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. Because Oklahoma's JOBS program has achieved a high participation rate, we can infer that these agencies are serving significant numbers of JOBS clients.

Discussion

Services obtained from other agencies through coordination are a significant addition to the services purchased with JOBS funds in most states. In states that are spending relatively large amounts for JOBS services, coordination appears to have the intended effect of accessing services for JOBS participants that are already available in the community. However, low expenditure states are relying on the resources of other agencies as an alternative to appropriating new funds for JOBS services. When welfare agencies are dependent on the resources of other agencies, and AFDC recipients must compete with other groups for these limited resources, there is no assurance that JOBS clients will be adequately served.

In several states, there are questions about the ability of the welfare agency to obtain services from other state and local agencies without payment. As a field associate noted:

> When the support services and the education, training and employment components are funded by JOBS, the case manager's brokerage ability will be strong. For those services and programs which are dependent on the cooperation and "good will" of other agencies on a nonreimbursed basis, obtaining access for a JOBS participant will be more difficult.

In the words of a state administrator, "Money talks." The ability of welfare agencies to purchase services for JOBS participants helps insure that they will have access to the education and training they need to become self-sufficient.

LINKAGES TO AND PROVISION OF SERVICES BY THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

In what ways and to what extent has the JTPA assisted in JOBS implementation?

The JTPA is playing a major role in JOBS implementation in all study states. In all states, formal interagency agreements have been negotiated between the JTPA and the welfare agency at the state and/or local levels. In eight of the states, these are financial contracts for services to be performed by the JTPA agencies. In two of these states, the JTPA has been given the lead responsibility for administering all or most components of JOBS. Additionally, in all states the JTPA is serving AFDC recipients with its own funds, but it is unclear whether more or fewer JTPA resources are being devoted to AFDC recipients than before JOBS implementation.

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program is potentially a major provider of employment and training services for JOBS participants. As the primary source of federal support for training disadvantaged individuals, its resources are available for AFDC recipients. As a network of organizations with experience in delivering services to these individuals, it also has the capacity to serve as a contractor for services financed through JOBS.

The structure of the JTPA program virtually insures that a share of its resources will be devoted to JOBS clients. The largest component of JTPA, Title II-A, is designed for economically disadvantaged youths and adults. Within this group, the Act encourages service to AFDC recipients by requiring that they be served on an "equitable basis," taking into account their proportion in the population. In addition, states have the option of using 6 percent of their Title II-A funds to provide their Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) with incentives to serve "hard-to-serve" individuals such as welfare recipients. They must also use 8 percent of these funds for education and for facilitating coordination between education and training services.

The Family Support Act permits welfare agencies to use JOBS funds to purchase services from the JTPA, to the extent that JTPA resources are not available for JOBS clients on a non-reimbursable basis. While the JTPA must serve AFDC recipients with its own funds, whether it also serves as a contractor to welfare agencies depends on state and local decisions.

The Family Support Act acknowledges the potential importance of the JTPA by requiring governors to coordinate the activities of the state welfare agency and the JTPA. Each study state has interpreted the mandate to coordinate in its own manner, and the range of organizational, financial, and programmatic linkages between JOBS and the JTPA is considerable.

At a minimum, coordination has been interpreted to include interagency planning, which was occurring in most states prior to JOBS. In all states, the JTPA was represented in the interagency planning process for JOBS implementation at the state level, and states with a local planning/coordination process generally require representation from the local JTPA SDA. In almost all states, the state welfare agency is represented on the State Job Training Coordinating Council, and in many states an administrator of the local welfare agency is a member of the local Private Industry Council.

Interagency Agreements

In all states, formal interagency agreements have been negotiated between welfare agencies and JTPA agencies concerning their linkage in implementing JOBS. In some states, these formal agreements have been written between the state welfare agency and the state JTPA agency or between the state welfare agency and the local SDA. In others, the agreements are between local welfare agencies and local SDAs. These agreements vary considerably in their specificity regarding the services to be provided by the JTPA and the financial reimbursement by the welfare agency, if any.

The strongest links between JOBS and the JTPA have been established in Maryland and Tennessee. In Maryland, an interagency agreement has been negotiated that transfers funds and responsibilities for all JOBS employment and training activities from the state welfare agency to the state agency administering the JTPA. JOBS funds are then allocated to the SDAs, which provide or contract for

all employment and training services for all JOBS participants in the state. Tennessee appropriated no funds for JOBS education, employment, and training services. To implement JOBS under these extreme conditions, the state agency administering the JTPA agreed to provide all JOBS services other than child care with JTPA funds. The obligation to provide services for JOBS clients is passed to each local SDA via contracts awarded by the state JTPA agency. Because the role of the JTPA is so significant in Maryland and Tennessee, the arrangements in each of these states are described in more detail below.

An interagency arrangement at the state level is also significant in Pennsylvania. The SPOC program, the centerpiece of the state's JOBS program, originated under the JTPA and is now operated jointly by the welfare agency, the JTPA, the employment security agency and the education agency. Using funds from various sources, the state contracts through the 28 JTPA Service Delivery Areas for SPOC activities. In state fiscal year 1990, 63 percent of spending on JOBS components (excluding supportive services) was contracted out through the SDAs under this arrangement.

Minnesota is taking advantage of the existing network of JTPA providers to deliver JOBS services, but without directly administering the program through the JTPA and its SDAs. This network consists of employment and training service providers (ETSPs) that are certified by the state employment and training agency. Under an agreement between the state welfare agency and the state employment and training agency, JOBS services and case management will be implemented and regulated through this network of ETSPs. In this way, welfare agencies are drawing on the expertise and capacity of JTPA providers without transferring responsibility to the JTPA.

In Oregon and Texas, contracts have been negotiated between the state welfare agency and selected SDAs for selected services. Oregon's welfare agency gave each local welfare service district the discretion to choose its prime contractor for those JOBS services that are not provided directly by the welfare agency. Nine of Oregon's 15 local service districts chose the SDA agency, while the other six districts chose community colleges. In Texas, services for the most job-ready clients, those in Service Level I, are being purchased by the state welfare agency through competitive contracts with public and private organizations. SDAS won these contracts in six of the state's 82 JOBS counties, although in none of the large urban areas. The Texas Department of Human Services and the state JTPA agency have signed a non-financial cooperative agreement to facilitate planning for services to AFDC recipients, but it does not outline the services to be provided. In the absence of significant state funding for JOBS in Texas, and its resulting reliance on the JTPA, the lack of a state-level agreement outlining the services to be provided by the JTPA is a source of concern.

In Michigan and New York, no contracts have been written at the state level between the welfare agency and the JTPA. These states give their local welfare agencies primary responsibility for securing JOBS services and discretion in choosing when to contract and with which organizations. In New York, more than 30 of the state's 58 local welfare districts have chosen to contract with the SDAs for JOBS services. Within both states, there is considerable variation in the types of agreements reached at the local level.

Oklahoma and Mississippi are the only states in which there are no financial contracts between the welfare agencies and the JTPA. The welfare agencies have, instead,

negotiated cooperative agreements or memoranda of understanding with the JTPA to provide services on a non-reimbursable basis. The Oklahoma welfare agency has cooperative agreements with each of the state's 12 SDAs to serve JOBS participants. Agreements between the agencies have been in place since the early 1980s and state welfare officials believe they have an excellent relationship with SDAs and that an adequate supply of services will be available for JOBS clients.

Mississippi's welfare agency has signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with two of the three SDAs in the state and expects to sign one with the third. These MOUs specify that

> the SDA shall offer its full range of services to its eligible participants who may also be AFDC clients. The SDA shall establish recipients of AFDC as target groups for SDA services, and shall set target levels for services to these groups.

In exchange, "the DHS shall offer its full range of services to its eligible clients who may also be eligible for JTPA." That is, the welfare agency must finance the supportive services for JOBS participants being served by the JTPA. It is too early to ascertain whether these MOUs will result in increased service to AFDC recipients.

In summary, JOBS has consolidated and extended the formal linkages between welfare agencies and JTPA agencies in all ten states. In eight states, state or local JTPA agencies are being paid as contractors to the welfare agencies. In Maryland and Tennessee, the JTPA agency has lead responsibility for administering most components of JOBS and for serving all JOBS participants. In Minnesota and Pennsylvania, JOBS draws on the JTPA infrastructure for management and service delivery. In the others, the JTPA has less overall responsibility for operating JOBS, but remains an important provider of services for JOBS participants.

JTPA Services on a Non-Reimbursable Basis

Prior to JOBS, all state JTPA programs were required to devote a share of their resources to AFDC recipients. Whether JOBS implementation will increase or decrease the JTPA resources allocated to welfare recipients is a critical question. Because Title II-A programs can offer most JOBS components as well as supportive services, they can potentially supplement the resources of the welfare agencies in implementing JOBS. On the other hand, state and local JTPA agencies may respond to the additional funding for JOBS services by diverting JTPA resources from welfare recipients to other groups.

The extent to which the JTPA focused on welfare recipients prior to JOBS implementation varied considerably, as shown in Table 8. In 1988-89, the fraction of adult JTPA participants who were welfare recipients ranged from 56 percent in Minnesota to 18 percent in Oklahoma. (In states where the JTPA serves higher fractions of welfare recipients, a smaller share of welfare recipients are on AFDC and a greater share receive general assistance and refugee assistance.)

All study states are relying on JTPA resources to implement JOBS. Some states, especially Tennessee and Texas, expect the JTPA to provide all or many of the education, training, and employment services for JOBS clients. Mississippi has also devoted small amounts of resources to JOBS and is relying on agreements with its SDAs to secure services for clients on a non-reimbursable basis. In other states, it is impossible to assess the contribution of JTPA resources, but its importance is widely acknowledged by program administrators.

Whether JOBS implementation has increased or decreased the JTPA resources devoted to AFDC recipients is unclear at this time. During the 1989-90 JTPA program year, five study states implemented JOBS: Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania. As Table 8 shows, four of these states served slightly more welfare recipients after JOBS was introduced and one state, Michigan, served significantly fewer recipients.

However, an increase in the number of AFDC recipients served by the JTPA does not imply an increase in the share of JTPA resources devoted to them. It is possible that the JTPA could serve more AFDC recipients, but devote the same or even a smaller share of its own resources to them. If JOBS funds are available to finance supportive services, for example, the JTPA could focus its own funds on providing employment and training services to more individuals. Or if JOBS funds are transferred to the JTPA and used to supplement JTPA resources, the number of AFDC recipients served by the JTPA could increase without additional JTPA funding. In Maryland, for example, where all funds for JOBS components are dispersed through the JTPA, most active Project Independence participants are co-enrolled in the JTPA program and counted as JTPA participants. The increase in the number of AFDC recipients served by the JTPA does not imply that more JTPA resources are being spent on their behalf.

Field associates reported that it is too early to tell how the JTPA has altered the share of its own resources spent on AFDC recipients. Even in Tennessee, where all resources for JOBS components are being provided by the JTPA, there is no definitive evidence that more resources are being devoted to AFDC recipients than prior to JOBS. The 2,023 AFDC recipients formally enrolled as JOBS participants will receive more intensive services, but the total number of AFDC recipients served through the JTPA is expected to decrease slightly in the first program year.

TABLE 8: Participation in JTPA Title II-A Programs by Adults on Welfare

	July 1988 – June 1989			July 1989 – June 1990		
	Participants on welfare		Percent of welfare participants on AFDC[1]	Participants on welfare		Percent of welfare participants on AFDC[1]
	Number	Percent of all participants		Number	Percent of all participants	
Maryland	4,273	50	94	5,296	54	93
Michigan	11,729	45	68	8,586	33	69
Minnesota	7,596	56	59	7,653	59	62
Mississippi	2,137	21	100	2,182	20	100
New York	14,130	39	63	12,245	42	61
Oklahoma	1,618	18	100	1,759	21	100
Oregon	1,832	23	96	1,565	23	95
Pennsylvania	11,182	46	67	11,313	50	70
Tennessee	3,540	23	95	3,551	25	96
Texas	7,406	19	100	7,605	19	100

1 Information on the type of welfare received by JTPA participants (i.e. AFDC, general assistance, or refugee assistance) is available only for terminees from the program.

Source: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Benefits of JOBS to JTPA Agencies

JTPA officials in several states argued that it is in their program's self interest to serve JOBS participants. For example, prior to enactment of the Family Support Act, Tennessee officials offered to increase services to AFDC recipients as a way of positioning the JTPA system to be the state's primary resource for providing employment and training services for the unemployed and disadvantaged. Project Independence in Maryland is a component of a broader economic development strategy under the JTPA. An official in one state argued that JOBS is a way for the SDAs to survive financially in the face of declining JTPA funds and that entrepreneurial SDA directors are eager to obtain contracts to provide JOBS services.

JTPA officials also mentioned that JOBS has made AFDC clients more attractive to serve because supportive services funds come "attached to the client." These funds lower the cost of serving JOBS clients and potentially enable them to be placed in longer-term training. One state JTPA official argued that transitional benefits make AFDC clients more attractive to serve. Transitional benefits, he argued, will permit welfare recipients to accept lower wage jobs, which are in greater supply than higher wage jobs. He also expressed the belief that transitional benefits will increase the percent of welfare recipients who are employed 13 weeks after termination from JTPA, one of the JTPA performance standards.

JTPA Operation of JOBS: Maryland and Tennessee

In Maryland and Tennessee, the JTPA has been given formal responsibility for administering most JOBS components. Interestingly, these states represent the two extremes of the study states in terms of their level of funding for JOBS. Maryland is spending large amounts for JOBS and drawing down a big share of its federal JOBS entitlement, while Tennessee appropriated no additional funds for JOBS education, training, and employment services and is drawing down the smallest share.

In Maryland, the JTPA organization took the lead in planning and implementing Project Independence (PI), enabling the governor to play a major role and make it a component of his economic development strategy. Policies and procedures for Project Independence were developed by the Governor's Employment and Training Council and the PI Management Team, which is supervised by the Council. Operational responsibility for PI at the state level was given to the Department of Economic and Employment Development (DEED), which in turn contracted with the JTPA Service Delivery Areas for local program implementation.

The welfare agency provides the JOBS orientation and performs the initial assessment, which determines whether recipients should be referred to education or the SDA. It is also responsible for arranging child care and other supportive services and for administering the conciliation/sanctioning process. The SDAs have full responsibility for providing employment and training activities. According to the cooperative agreement between the two agencies, the SDAs are also held responsible for ensuring that the federal mandates for participation and targeting are met.

In Tennessee, the Department of Labor took the initiative in obtaining responsibility for JOBS. In 1988, the Tennessee JTPA program, which is administered by the Department of Labor, had a substantial balance of unused carryover funds. Department officials believed passage of the welfare reform legislation then pending in Congress would bring added training and support services funds into the state, and they wanted to position the JTPA system to be the provider of these expanded services. With this objective, a plan was developed to use $4.8 million of these

unused JTPA funds to provide employment and training services for AFDC recipients. When the state legislature failed to appropriate new funds for JOBS employment and training, reliance on the JTPA became the most feasible approach for implementing the program.

The responsibilities of the JTPA are specified clearly in a contract between the Department of Human Services and the Department of Labor. The contract represents a negotiated bargain between the two agencies. The Department of Labor accepts the JOBS funds for child care and other supportive services from the Department of Human Services. In exchange, it makes a commitment to use JTPA-funded resources to provide whatever education, training, or placement services are needed by 2,023 JOBS participants. The 2,023 participants are the estimated number needed to meet the 7 percent participation requirement in 1991.

Compared with Maryland, Tennessee has transferred more functions to the JTPA. Tennessee welfare agencies first provide the JOBS orientation and perform an initial screening, and then refer recipients who volunteer for JOBS to the JTPA. The JTPA is responsible for all other activities, including assessment, employability plan development, referral to all services, and assistance in arranging child care and other supportive services. Welfare offices become involved again only during the conciliation/sanctioning process.

Discussion

Welfare agencies in all study states are drawing upon the expertise and capacity developed by the JTPA. To a greater or lesser extent, the JTPA administrative infrastructure and network of employment and training providers have served as a foundation for JOBS implementation. JTPA organizations will probably continue to play a major role in JOBS as contractors to welfare agencies. But whether JTPA resources will continue to support JOBS, as they do in Tennessee and as program administrators hope they will in Mississippi and Texas, is less certain.

The importance of the JTPA as a resource for JOBS may change during the course of program implementation. In the early years, the amount of federal JTPA funds is large relative to the capped federal entitlement for JOBS. In federal fiscal year 1990, for example, the JTPA block grant to the states for employment and training programs was $1.745 billion, compared to $800 million for JOBS. Unlike JOBS, JTPA funds require no state match. From the perspective of fiscally constrained states, using JTPA resources to implement JOBS is an attractive alternative. However, because JTPA funds are sufficient to serve only a small fraction of all eligible disadvantaged people, over the longer run the availability of JOBS funding may discourage the JTPA from using its own resources for AFDC clients. As the federal capped entitlement for JOBS increases to $1.3 billion, and if the budgetary position of the states enables them to match these funds more fully, the JTPA may face pressures to allocate its funds to other groups.

LINKAGES TO AND PROVISION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

One of the most significant features of the Family Support Act is the emphasis given to education. For the first time, federal funds are authorized for educational services as a major strategy to reduce welfare dependency. What emphasis are states giving to educational services under JOBS, and what is the role of state education agencies in the JOBS programs?

The role of educational services in welfare-to-work programs is perceived by state administrators as having increased as a result of JOBS or state initiated welfare-to-work programs preceding JOBS. States project at least modest increases in the number of participants receiving educational services and in expenditures for these services under JOBS. The role of state education agencies in state JOBS programs is an emerging one. States have established, or are beginning to establish, linkages between state welfare and education agencies through both financial and non-financial interagency agreements for services. Four states have developed specific mechanisms for fostering the coordination of welfare and education services on the local level.

States are required to offer basic educational activities, including high school or equivalent education, basic and remedial education to achieve a basic literacy level, and education for people with limited English proficiency. States may elect to also offer postsecondary or other education as allowed by the federal regulations.

The participation requirements established by Congress in the Family Support Act provide additional emphasis to the educational components of the JOBS legislation. Custodial parents under age 20 who have not completed high school or its equivalent are required to participate in educational activities full-time, even if they have a child under the age of one or three. If they fail to make good progress, or educational activity is inappropriate, teenage custodial parents may be required to participate in non-educational activities. In addition, custodial parents under age 24 who have not completed high school and are not currently enrolled in high school or its equivalent are one of the target groups for JOBS programs.

Within broad parameters, states retain control over the means of establishing relationships between the state welfare and education agencies. The legislation requires that governors assure coordination among the states' employment, training, and education programs. The welfare agency is required to consult with the state education agency to promote coordination of the planning and delivery of services with the state's education programs. A maintenance of effort provision specifies that federal JOBS funds may not be used to supplant state and local outlays for existing services and activities, nor for activities that are routinely provided on a non-reimbursable basis, such as free public school education. Beyond this maintenance of effort provision, there are no requirements that states spend their JOBS funds on education services or establish any particular type of relationship with educational agencies.

Given these provisions, states have a range of choices in deciding how to organize, deliver, and finance educational services as well as whether and how much to increase the supply of educational services for JOBS participants. Variation in state responses to education services is also fostered by the variety of institutions providing education; the diversity of state, local, and federal funding streams to finance education; and the need to serve both teenage custodial parents and adults whose educational needs differ.

For the states included in this study, the role of state education agencies in state welfare employment programs may be characterized as an emerging one. State education agencies, in general, are the newest players in welfare employment programs, and

the states are in various stages of establishing relationships between the state welfare and education agencies. In considering the relationships between education and welfare, we have examined the inclusion of state education agencies in the planning and monitoring of JOBS as well as the various state initiatives to establish linkages between the two state agencies and between local welfare and education providers. In addition, we have addressed the states' choices for educational services and state-level changes undertaken in response to the JOBS legislation.

Role of State Education Agencies in Planning and Oversight

As required by the federal legislation, state education agencies were consulted in the planning process for JOBS. Several mechanisms were used by the study states to accomplish this. In one of the study states, the governor established an interagency task force that included the state education agency to propose the state's legislative response to JOBS. More typical of the states was the establishment of an interagency committee that included the education agency and assumed responsibility for both planning the state's response to JOBS and providing ongoing oversight. In Oklahoma, for example, an interagency task force includes representatives from the Board of Regents, the Department of Vocational and Technical Education, and the Department of Education. This task force provides a forum for dialogue about the JOBS program and for addressing some of the interagency concerns. Similar types of interagency committees have been established in Oregon and Tennessee.

The states of Maryland and Pennsylvania have developed somewhat different models for involving education as well as other agencies and organizations in interagency planning and oversight. In Maryland, the Governor's Employment and Training Council develops policy and planning for all of the state's employment and training programs. Actual oversight of the program is provided by a management team composed of state and local administrators as well as JTPA's Private Industry Councils. Representatives from education are included in both of these bodies. Pennsylvania has established a Joint Jobs Initiative Task Force composed of representatives from the Departments of Public Welfare, Education, and Labor and Industry (the agency responsible for JTPA and the employment service). This group meets biweekly and, together, its members have management responsibility for SPOC, the intensive JOBS program in the state.

Linkages between the State Welfare and Education Agencies

In addition to the use of joint or interagency coordinating committees, such mechanisms as interagency agreements or contracts have been developed for establishing ongoing linkages between state welfare and education agencies. In Oklahoma, for example, the Department of Human Services has entered into interagency agreements with two state educational agencies—the State Department of Education and the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. These agreements call for the provision of such services as adult basic education, literacy programs, GED preparation, and short-term vocational training for JOBS participants on a non-reimbursable basis. (The agreement with the State Department of Education also includes a financial agreement, which is discussed below.) A non-financial agreement characterizes the relationship between the state agencies in Mississippi and Michigan. The potential significance of this type of agreement should not be underestimated. In Michigan, it is estimated that 18,000 clients receive GED preparation, high school completion, or remedial education through

the local public schools using state education funding targeted to those without a high school education.

In New York, where counties usually secure services, several strategies have been used to foster the link between welfare and education. At the state level, the Department of Social Services and the State Education Department developed during the mid-1980s several interagency initiatives designed to improve the access of public assistance recipients to education and training programs. In 1988, New York welfare and education agencies developed a Joint Action Agreement in response to both "the challenge of welfare reform" and "the large and growing disparity between education and skills attainments of public assistance recipients and the increasing skills required by the employer community." This agreement is viewed as providing a foundation for a new working relationship and for more systematic cooperation between the two agencies. Most immediately, the agreement introduced three new interagency programs for serving adult public assistance recipients. One of these initiatives, called Adult Centers for Comprehensive Educational and Support Services, developed full-service centers offering assessment, counseling, case management, education (basic skills, GED, ESL, life skills, and workplace literacy), vocational training, job placement, and support services, including child care. All three initiatives are funded through multiple state and federal funding sources, including JTPA, Vocational Education Act, Adult Education Act, and state education and welfare funds.

In Oregon, another state with a well developed welfare-to-work program prior to JOBS, the Department of Education has only recently become involved in the state's JOBS program. What role the Department of Education will play has yet to be determined and is constrained by funding issues and its limited role as an advisor to local public schools. At this time, the linkage between the two state agencies is informal. No greater incentives for state education agencies to serve AFDC recipients than before JOBS have been introduced, and the state education agency has not redesigned any educational services in response to JOBS. Clearly, however, the interests of the two agencies do intersect. Oregon has given priority to young parents on welfare in its JOBS program, and the state welfare agency requires that at least one local school superintendent serve on the local service district's advisory committee. Recent changes in public school law now require that public schools must provide and finance alternative education programs as well as provide more adult education services.

In Texas, considerable state-level activity was undertaken by educational agencies in response to the JOBS legislation. The Texas Education Agency (TEA), through its Adult and Community Education Division, has worked with the Department of Human Services to expand educational services specifically for JOBS participants. This interagency relationship was promoted by the Texas Legislature, which appropriated an additional $1 million to TEA for each year of the FY 1990–91 biennium to expand education services to AFDC recipients. The state funding for adult education was made available to TEA's network of providers at the substate level, the Adult Education Cooperatives. By December 1990, 56 of the 62 Adult Education Cooperatives were serving JOBS participants. As with most educational services, the Adult Education Cooperatives are a decentralized system retaining control over service provision. In this instance, the Cooperatives have decided to treat JOBS participants as they do other clients, and no special adjustments have been made to accommodate JOBS participants or to respond to either the targeting requirements or the required hours of service.

More selectively, several state welfare agencies have entered into financial contracts or agreements for specific educational services from the state's education agency. For example, through a fixed fee contract between the state welfare and education agencies in Oklahoma, 40 learning centers throughout the state provide classes exclusively for public assistance recipients when the demand for these educational services exceeds the learning centers' capacity to supply them through their regular offerings. These classes are scheduled for 20 hours a week, and each learning center is reimbursed on the basis of the clients served. In Pennsylvania, two contracts for the education and training for AFDC teen parents have been negotiated. Mississippi is using JOBS funds to increase the number of GED teachers as well as educational materials through contractual arrangements with the state education agency.

Unlike the other states, Minnesota has established no formal linkages of any sort between the state welfare and education agencies. Further, although Minnesota places a strong emphasis on education as a means to economic self-sufficiency, the Minnesota Department of Education has not been intensively involved with the implementation of JOBS. (The state education agency was, however, involved in the beginning development and implementation of the state's earlier welfare reform initiatives.) However, educational policy in Minnesota has given particular attention to young people at high risk in traditional school systems, as well as to adults age 21 and over who are economically disadvantaged and interested in working on a high school diploma. Additionally, the Adult Basic Education program in the state gives high priority to serving individuals on public assistance and has actively recruited persons on public assistance since the 1970s. Overall, 10,329 or 59.8 percent of Project STRIDE participants attended educational activities in state fiscal year 1990. Even without formal linkages between the two state agencies, it is clear that education is strongly emphasized in Minnesota's JOBS program and that a high proportion of JOBS participants are able to access education at all levels.

State Directives for Local Linkages with Education

States have also fostered the link between welfare and education by placing greater emphasis on coordination between local welfare agencies and local education agencies. This strategy recognizes the historical autonomy of local school districts and colleges as well as the intrastate variation in the types of available education providers. In the mid-1980s, New York, a state-supervised welfare system, sought to further the linkages with the State Education Department by requiring local welfare districts to involve operators of established welfare education programs in the development of local plans for welfare employment programs. (Welfare education programs are state-funded education programs for public assistance recipients that have been operated by the State Education Department since 1963.) Further, local district plans for welfare employment plans became subject to review by the State Education Department in addition to the State Department of Social Services and State Job Training Coordinating Council. Similar strategies are used in two other study states. Michigan requires that the development of local plans include a preview by the local school district, and Oregon requires that a superintendent of a local school district be a member of the local service area's advisory committee.

In two of the study states, agreements or contracts between the local JOBS agency and local education agencies are used to formalize the delivery of educa-

tional services. In Maryland, the JTPA service delivery areas (SDAs) establish agreements with the local education agency, and the cost of remedial education is paid for by the SDA. In Oregon, some contractual arrangements have been established between the local service district and the local school district to provide services for the young parent program.

A major player in some states' JOBS programs is the community college system. New York, Oregon, and Pennsylvania involved community colleges in their pre-JOBS programs, and they continue their involvement under JOBS. For example, in Oregon community colleges serve as the primary contractors for six of the state's fifteen service districts. In Tennessee the link with community colleges, which administer 7 of the 14 JTPA SDAs, was furthered through the process of completing the state JOBS plan. In general, these linkages between welfare and community colleges appear to be established primarily at the local level. Additional information on the role of local education providers, including community colleges, will be obtained in our study of local agency operations.

Educational Services

Overall, for the states in this study, the role of educational services in welfare employment programs is perceived by state administrators to have increased as a result of JOBS or state-initiated welfare reform efforts preceding JOBS. In general, the states are projecting at least modest increases in the number of participants in educational activities and in expenditures for these services.

States such as Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Pennsylvania have been placing emphasis on educational services in their welfare employment programs for a number of years. But for other states, program developments or modifications have been necessary to respond to the educational mandates of the JOBS legislation. Maryland responded to the federal legislation by modifying its welfare employment program to provide remedial educational opportunities for 2,000 clients under age 21. Texas devoted a significant share of its increased funding for JOBS services to education for adult JOBS participants. And in Tennessee, although no state funds have been allocated, a much stronger emphasis has been placed on remedial education than existed under its WIN Demonstration program. Tennessee's JOBS program has gone beyond the federal law and regulations for remedial education by requiring that JOBS participants who have not completed high school or a GED and are not currently enrolled must enroll in an educational activity.

The effect of the legislation's strong emphasis on education, even in states with well developed welfare employment programs, was captured well by one state administrator:

> The implementation of JOBS for us is basically an implementation placing a heavier emphasis on education....About 50 percent of our client population did not have a high school diploma.

This need for educational services was noted in a number of other states as well. For example, in New York, 58 percent of public assistance recipients have not completed high school and 15 percent have not gone beyond the 8th grade. In Tennessee, it is estimated that one-third of all AFDC adults are functionally illiterate.

By law, states are required to offer basic educational activities, including high school or equivalent education, basic and remedial education, and education for individuals with limited English proficiency. Eight of the states in the study have

also included post-secondary education in their JOBS programs. Three states (New York, Maryland, and Texas) have limited post-secondary education to two years. Four states will allow education up to a bachelor's degree and one state, Minnesota, has placed no restrictions on the number of years or the level of degree. Oregon and Michigan have not included post-secondary education in their JOBS program. However, post-secondary education may be approved as a self-initiated educational activity in these states. Oregon limits self-initiated educational activities to 18 months, while Michigan will allow education leading to a bachelor's degree. Since implementing JOBS, Michigan has experienced an increase in self-initiated education and training, primarily college-level education. Overall, post-secondary education shows an increase of almost 35 percent between FY 1989 and 1990.

Issues in Implementation

Two states, Pennsylvania and Texas, experienced delays in accessing federal funds for education services. In Texas, the delays occurred as a result of difficulties in negotiating the required contractual agreement between the Texas Department of Human Services and the Texas Education Agency.

The most significant delay in the start-up of expanded educational services occurred in Pennsylvania due to federal regulatory restrictions on the use of matching funds. The Department of Public Welfare entered into a contract with the Department of Education for a teen pregnancy and parenting program intended to expand a program that emphasized a return to, or the continuation of, high school education for pregnant teens. The agencies issued requests for proposals, inviting local school districts to submit proposals with local school funds providing the required state matching funds.

However, at the time Pennsylvania attempted to initiate this expansion, the federal regulations were interpreted as preventing the use of local school funds as matching funds. The state explored channeling the local funds through the state agencies, but at the time of the study, the state had not received a response from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services clarifying the federal regulations on this issue. Additionally, the local school districts were hesitant to channel the funds to the state agencies, "apparently fearing that the funds will somehow be converted into fungible resources at the state level, creating the potential for offsetting declines in state aid through other funding programs" (Field Associate Report.) As a result of these regulatory barriers, Pennsylvania expected $1.2 million of federal funds and $.8 million of local funds budgeted for this program to go unused in FY 1991. Federal guidelines issued in December 1990, specifying terms under which the funds of other agencies may be used as part of a state's match, should prevent similar situations in the future.

Other issues facing the study states in relation to education services include the requirement that participants be scheduled for an average of 20 hours a week of JOBS activities (referred to as the 20-hour rule), finding state or local funding sources to match federal funds, and overloads on adult basic education services.

In at least two of the study states (Maryland and Tennessee), existing basic education and adult literacy programs offered throughout the state consist of no more than several hours per week of remedial instruction, frequently provided by volunteer tutors in Tennessee. The concern about this arrangement is two-fold: the amount of time devoted to remedial education is probably not sufficient to reduce

functional literacy deficits within a short time, and the current level of participation does not allow these programs to meet the JOBS participation requirement for scheduling 20 hours each week. To address this issue, Maryland plans to explore having its employment and training contractors offer more intensive educational services to clients, which would probably increase the share of funds provided for educational services.

In Tennessee, state Department of Education officials report that the JOBS program has already created a serious overload on the capacity of the adult basic education services and that more resources are needed to respond to the increased demand. However, the state agency does not have additional resources to allocate to local providers. In New York, state administrators suspect that the current system for adult educational services is now operating at capacity and will not be able to expand further without the development of additional educational slots or different programming. Planning is now underway between the state welfare and education agencies to expand the availability of educational services.

Discussion

The Family Support Act's emphasis on education and the associated availability of federal funding for educational services provided through the JOBS program have encouraged the states in this study to at least maintain, if not increase, the emphasis given to educational services in welfare employment programs. Even at this initial stage of JOBS implementation, the legislation has fostered an increase in the provision of educational services to those participating in the states' JOBS programs. This finding on the increased use of education services parallels Greenberg's (1990) earlier findings based on initial reports from 15 states to the Office of Family Assistance. Further, although the linkages between state education and welfare agencies are just beginning in most states, the legislation has provided an incentive for these interagency relationships to develop and expand in most states. The evolution of these state-level interagency linkages will be considered in the third round of research. However, these interagency linkages may be of less significance than anticipated. Although one might assume that the establishment of strong interagency linkages would be necessary for increased access to educational services by welfare recipients, the high rates of participation in educational activities by Minnesota's JOBS participants do not rely on formal linkages between the two state agencies. It is possible that alternative strategies, such as initiatives undertaken by state education agencies to serve the economically disadvantaged or by local welfare and education agencies, may be equally or even more effective in leading to increased access to educational services.

Four states in this study have established mechanisms to foster the coordination of welfare and educational services at the local level. These states as well as the others may find a greater need to coordinate and link services on the local level as they further develop their JOBS programs to provide educational activities. More specifically, as they respond to the need to serve young parents through educational activities, states may find a greater need to coordinate with and link services to local school districts which are the primary source of funding for education for young people. Because local school districts retain considerable autonomy and state education agencies are limited in their ability to mandate services at the local level, it may be necessary to forge these linkages between welfare and education primarily on the local level. Oregon, with its established priority for serving young parents, has already recognized the important role of

local school districts in designing services for teens and allows local service districts to contract directly for services from local schools.

For adults, who may have different learning needs than teenagers, other linkages may need to be explored at the local level to provide literacy training, adult basic education, ESL, GED preparation, and vocational training or post-secondary education. Support for adult education is possible through several federal programs, including the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and JTPA. Combining these funds with state and federal JOBS funds, as has been done in New York, may allow states to maximize available resources.

The 20-hour rule poses a number of difficulties for the states in providing all levels of educational services, from adult basic education to college programs. Assuming the continuation of the 20-hour rule for participation, state agencies may need to negotiate for or contract with local educational providers for educational programs or educational programs combined with other activities that will facilitate meeting the federal requirements for scheduling, on average, 20 hours a week of JOBS activities for participants. In addressing this issue, states may need to decide if separate classes should be designed for JOBS participants, as has been done in one program in Oklahoma, or if JOBS participants should be enrolled in classes open to the community generally. Separating JOBS participants from others may have the advantage of allowing programs to be tailored more specifically to their needs, including meeting the 20-hour rule and establishing mechanisms for monitoring attendance. However, some state administrators have raised concerns about this approach. It may create a two-tiered system of adult education in local communities and increase the stigma experienced by public assistance recipients.

The 20-hour rule becomes particularly problematic for college education in which 12 to 15 hours of course work is considered full-time enrollment. By ignoring the time needed for studying and by requiring 20 hours of participation, the federal regulations potentially exclude these participants from meeting the JOBS requirements and thus counting toward the state's participation rate, unless additional hours are scheduled for these students or their hours of scheduled participation are balanced with other JOBS participants who are scheduled for more than 20 hours each week. Scheduling additional hours of participation may result not only in the development of artificial activities unrelated to the employability plan, but also in undermining the student's ability to perform satisfactorily in full-time college study. The balancing of participation hours between those who participate less than 20 hours with those who participate more than 20 hours each week introduces complex accounting procedures in the tracking of scheduled hours of participation. While some states may have the capacity to handle this averaging of scheduled hours of participation, others may not. Potentially, the 20-hour rule may create a disincentive to some states for enrolling welfare recipients in two-year or four-year college programs because of the issues involved in combining program components or in averaging scheduled hours across JOBS participants.

Program Highlight

In Oklahoma, a special project called the Educational Opportunity Center has been developed in conjunction with Rogers College to assist clients in gaining access to postsecondary education programs and to improve their chances of success in these programs. Serving a 21-county area in eastern Oklahoma, the center offers assessments of learning needs, career development services, assistance in gaining

admissions to a post-secondary educational program, post-enrollment support assistance, and follow-up studies. These services are perceived as recruitment activities for the state college system and are provided to JOBS participants on a non-reimbursable basis.

VI

CHILD CARE AND OTHER SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Child care and other supportive services may be critical factors in facilitating participation in JOBS by AFDC recipients. The Family Support Act recognizes the importance of these services by increasing the funding for child care services and by authorizing states to provide a range of other supportive services, including transportation, work-related expenses, and other work-related supportive services such as parenting and life-skills training, counseling, and substance abuse remediation. Work-related supportive services may also include services to the children of participants, if these are required for JOBS participation. The provisions for child care and other supportive services represent potential avenues for recognizing the two-generational potential of JOBS.

This section presents the research findings related to child care, including access to child care, the supply of child care, payment methods, and linkages to early childhood education programs, as well as information regarding the states' responses to the Act's provisions for other supportive services and work-related expenses.

CHILD CARE SERVICES

The Family Support Act recognizes the availability of child care as a critical factor in facilitating participation in JOBS by requiring that child care be guaranteed for children of AFDC participants in JOBS activities and by significantly liberalizing public financing for child care. Is the availability of child care services and funding expected to restrict access to the states' JOBS programs?

At the time of the study, state administrators did not expect the availability of child care services or funding to affect the states' abilities to achieve the federally mandated participation rates of 7 percent for 1990 and 1991. However, the lack of sufficient child care funds has already required, or may require in the future, limiting access to the JOBS programs. Tennessee and Texas recognize the potential need to restrict program access in the future because of insufficient child care funding. To control child care costs in its program, Minnesota restricted access to JOBS in May 1990 by narrowing the groups eligible for services.

New York was the only state to indicate a concern about an adequate supply of child care slots to meet the needs of JOBS participants. It is also the only state with an explicit policy regarding parental choice: if a client requests assistance in locating child care, state law requires that the client be offered two choices of regulated providers or be excused from program participation.

The child care provisions of the Family Support Act recognize that the availability of child care will be a critical factor in facilitating the participation of

AFDC recipients in the JOBS program as well as in the transition to employment and economic self-sufficiency. To meet the child care needs of JOBS participants and employed AFDC recipients, the Family Support Act significantly liberalized both the eligibility for child care and its public financing.

The legislation requires that child care be guaranteed for children of AFDC recipients participating in JOBS activities. Additionally, child care must be available, if needed, for recipients to accept employment. In a significant departure from previous legislation, Congress also authorized the provision of transitional child care for up to 12 months to families who become ineligible for AFDC because of earned income. Federal funding for child care, which was capped and severely constrained under WIN, was made an open-ended entitlement under the Family Support Act. State expenditures are matched at the Medicaid rate, which ranges from 50 to 80 percent.

Under the Act, state welfare agencies retained the authority to determine the method of payment for child care. These options include providing care directly, purchasing care under contract, using vouchers, providing cash advances, providing reimbursement, or using the child care disregard, which is the amount of earnings that may be set aside for child care before the AFDC grant is reduced because of earnings. States also retain some discretion over the amount of payment for child care. States may pay the actual cost of child care up to the local market rates for child care, but they are not required to pay more than the child care disregard, which is equal to $175 per month for children age two and older and $200 per month for younger children.

The regulation of the quality of child care also falls under the state's guidance. The federal legislation requires that child care meet the standards established by state and local law. Section 301 of the Act provides for federal grants to the states to improve their child care licensing and regulation and to monitor the child care of AFDC recipients.

Consideration of child care in this phase of the study focused primarily on state policies and actions affecting the quantity and quality of child care for JOBS participants. Transitional child care benefits will be examined in a later phase of the study. This phase of the study also preceded the implementation of the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

Access to Child Care

In general, state administrators across the 10 study states did not expect child care to be a difficulty in operating the JOBS program. More specifically, they did not expect the availability of child care services or funding to affect the states' ability to achieve the federal mandates for participation rates of 7 percent in 1990 and 1991. However, administrators in Tennessee and Texas recognized the *potential* need to restrict access to JOBS because of insufficient child care funding. In Texas, state officials were projecting a potential need to deny access to JOBS late in FY 1991 because of insufficient child care funds. This may jeopardize their ability to achieve the 7 percent participation rate. Minnesota has already found it necessary to restrict access to JOBS because of insufficient child care funding. Minnesota's experience with insufficient child care funding is discussed in some depth below.

States have assumed their responsibility for providing child care to JOBS participants who need it, even if this means restricting access to the JOBS program.

Among the states, the actual interpretation of child care as a "guarantee" varies. State officials in Oklahoma and New York characterized child care as an "entitlement" for JOBS participants. As one official stated:

> If you meet the income test for child care, whether you are on welfare or not, and you can find a licensed child care provider, it is an entitlement. The state adjusts its money to make sure that child care can be paid for. Therefore, if a provider is available there is not a reason for anyone to be excused from JOBS because of child care.

In the two states that regard child care as an entitlement, the state funding available for child care was not viewed as a constraint.

Recognizing the potential limits on the availability of state and local funds for child care for JOBS participants, the approach of the other study states to child care as a guarantee may be characterized as a "quasi-entitlement"—to be guaranteed as long as state and local funding are sufficient. If funding is insufficient for child care, mandatory participants may be "considered to have a *barrier* to participation" and thus may be excused from JOBS participation.

Minnesota's Experience. Minnesota began experiencing the lack of sufficient child care funding shortly after implementing its JOBS program. With the increasing enrollment in Project STRIDE, the state Department of Human Services found it necessary in August 1989 to set child care priorities for the counties' use of the Child Care Fund—a Department of Human Services funding stream for five overlapping child care subsidy programs serving both AFDC and non-AFDC families. Counties were directed, as first priority, to provide guaranteed child care assistance, up to the limits of their Child Care Fund allocation, to those required to participate in JOBS and those eligible for 12 months of transitional benefits. Many counties were already fully encumbered when the state's directives became operational, but most were able to absorb the additional costs. However, across seven counties, 200 non-AFDC low-income families lost their child care subsidy. (These families were later reinstated through state legislation in May 1990.) In January 1990, the state Department of Human Services again found it necessary to restrict access to child care funding by further specifying categories of recipients as having priority for child care.

In May 1990, the state legislature responded to the deficiency in child care funds through several actions. First, the legislature established separate child care funding for AFDC and non-AFDC families and established different eligibility criteria for the two. Second, the legislature limited the AFDC Child Care Program to five groups: participants in Project STRIDE, participants in the Self-Employment Investment Demonstration project, participants in the New Chance Program, AFDC recipients who are employed and have child care expenses above the disregard, and transition-year families, i.e., families who lose AFDC eligibility due to increased hours of employment, increased income from employment, or the loss of income disregards due to time limitations.

Access to Project STRIDE was also restricted by the state legislature by narrowing two of the target groups. The state legislature changed the 36 or more months requirement on AFDC to 48 or more months over the last 60 months, and the legislature restricted participation to those under age 22 rather than 24 years for custodial parents who have not completed a high school education or a GED program or have little or no work experience in the preceding year. As a result of

these actions, Project STRIDE eligibility for AFDC recipients was restricted to those two groups and to those whose participation began prior to May 1, 1990, to recipients who are members of a family in which the youngest child is within two years of being ineligible for AFDC due to age, and to recipients in the state's two demonstration programs. The legislature did provide that, at the direction of the Commissioner of Human Services, additional groups may be allowed to participate in Project STRIDE if this is necessary to meet the federal participation rates or if available monies are not being fully utilized.

Third, the legislature eliminated the separate allocation to each county for the AFDC Child Care Program. Counties are now reimbursed for eligible child care expenses on an entitlement basis from the state Child Care Fund, which functions without a limited allocation. Fourth, the legislature passed a supplemental child care appropriation.

Supply of Child Care

In nine of the states, state administrators anticipated that the supply of child care would be sufficient to meet the needs of those participating in JOBS. However, providers in rural areas were acknowledged to be somewhat limited. Locating and arranging both infant care and shift care were acknowledged as problematic areas in Texas. In New York, there was a more general concern among state officials about an adequate supply of child care slots. Michigan officials, while not identifying insufficient supply for JOBS participants as a concern, recognized a shortage of child care generally in the state. This shortage, while not directly interfering with participation in the MOST program, does increase the difficulty faced by front-line workers in arranging child care for JOBS participants.

Since the implementation of JOBS, states have not experienced major changes in the types of child care used or the extent to which a particular type of care is used by welfare recipients. There are suggestions from both Maryland and Texas, however, that informal child care may be expanding. Under the JOBS program in Texas, the range of child care options has increased: parents now have the choice of using self-arranged care provided by neighbors, friends, or non-parenting relatives. This suggests that more child care used by welfare recipients may be provided in informal settings as the JOBS program expands. This may be particularly true in the Hispanic communities, which have traditionally preferred informal care arrangements using members of the extended family.

The states included in this study have not enacted formal policies that explicitly encourage one type of child care over another, i.e., regulated care vs. unregulated care. However, some policies adopted across the states regarding child care placement priorities, payment procedures, and varying payment amounts governed by the type of child care arrangement may indirectly establish preferences. For example, guidelines developed in Tennessee for selecting child care for JOBS participants rank unregulated care as the fourth choice following various types of regulated care. This is not, however, a rigid policy that conflicts with a parent's right to choose unregulated child care.

Across the states, unregulated care is reimbursed at lower rates than regulated care, and its use could potentially conserve state funds. If state funds for child care are constrained, the lower rates of reimbursement for unregulated care could indirectly promote its use as the preferred type of child care arrangement for JOBS participants. Alternatively, the lower costs associated with informal child care

could lead to a type of "creaming" in which those who have access to informal child care are given preference or priority for participation in JOBS programs. Additionally, if a client has access to informal child care, the demands upon the agency for arranging child care services for JOBS participants may be reduced.

Parental Choice

A major concern in requiring participation in JOBS activities of parents with preschool children has been the degree of parental choice that will be offered to parents in arranging child care. New York has developed an explicit policy regarding the extent of parental choice: if a client requests assistance in locating child care, the agency is required by state law to offer at least two choices of providers who are regulated, accessible, and available, and who are willing to accept the amount or type of payment offered. If the agency is unable to provide these choices, the agency must offer the client the option of obtaining her own child care and excuse her from participation until child care is located by either the client or the agency. The intent of this state provision was to protect parents from being required to use unregulated child care in order to participate in JOBS.

Although New York is the only state with an explicit policy regarding parental choice, other states have addressed this issue through different mechanisms. One approach has been to focus on educating the consumer about selecting quality child care that matches the needs of the child. For example, Oregon requires each of its local districts to provide consumer education services to inform JOBS participants about the availability of child care, as well as to stress that selecting child care is based on the parents' choices, not those of agency personnel.

Pennsylvania illustrates a second approach for providing both consumer education and expanding access to providers. The state has developed a demonstration project covering 68 percent of the state's AFDC population that establishes county-based programs to assist families in locating community providers, to counsel families on selecting child care services, and to manage payment to providers. In other states, similar services emphasizing parental choice are to be provided by the local IV-A agency staff. In some states, however, parents are viewed as assuming primary responsibility for selecting and arranging child care with little formalized assistance. A third approach, used by Minnesota, has been to more closely monitor counties to ensure that counties do not restrict the choice of legal providers or discourage the use of relatives and informal family care.

Payment Mechanisms and the Use of Market Rates

The payment methods chosen by the states are shown in Table 9. The range in choices runs from using only one method, which Oregon selected, to using all five methods, which New York selected. The most frequently selected option is purchase of service; only New York has included providing cash in advance as an optional method for child care payments.

A major decision for states in conjunction with JOBS was whether to pay up to the local market rate for child care. All but one of the study states elected to base their allowable child care payments on local market rates. The range in state payment limits for child care is shown in Table 9. Michigan, which elected to limit the amount of payment to the monthly child care disregard, provides the lowest level of payment, while New York, with a state-wide limit of $883.32, allows for the highest payment rate.

The use of market rates significantly increased the amount of the child care payment rates in Oklahoma, Oregon, and, most dramatically, Tennessee, where the average payment rate increased 50 percent. In New York, the use of local market rates affected various types of care or areas differently: rates were significantly increased for rural areas, and an increase was authorized for family day care, while center care remained at essentially the same level.

Slight decreases in payment rates for child care were experienced by Mississippi and Texas. In both states, the decrease is not expected to have a direct impact upon the supply of child care for JOBS participants. For Pennsylvania, the JOBS legislation introduced an upper limit for child care payments that are reimbursable with federal dollars. Potentially, this change could generate access problems if the upper limits are too low for selected areas in the state. Overall, however, these changes in the amount of child care reimbursement are not expected to have a significant impact on the type of child care used by AFDC recipients involved in the states' JOBS programs.

In Minnesota, basing allowable child care payments on the local market rates had no effect on the state's child care payment rates. By acknowledging the vari-

TABLE 9: Methods of Payment for Child Care[1]

State	Method of Payment	Statewide Limit per month[2]
Maryland	Income Disregard, Voucher in Advance, Purchase of Service	$328.95 / $268.75
Michigan	Direct, Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service	$200 / $175
Minnesota[3]	Income Disregard, Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service	$617 / $538; $4,300 – handicapped
Mississippi	Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service	$216 / $204
New York	Direct, Income Disregard, Cash in Advance, Voucher in Advance, Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service, Other	$883.32
Oklahoma	Direct, Voucher in Advance, Purchase of Service	$372 / $341
Oregon	Direct	$450
Pennsylvania[3]	Income Disregard, Cash in Advance, Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service, Other	$580.50
Tennessee	Income Disregard, Purchase of Service	$270.90 / $227.90
Texas	Cash Reimbursement, Purchase of Service	$482; $916 – handicapped

1 Source: Summary of Options under the Supportive Services Plan prepared by Family Support Administration/Office of Family Asssistance/JOBS Task Force, 12/10/90.
2 When two amounts are shown separated by a slash (/), the first amount is the statewide limit for children under 2. The second amount is the statewide limit for children over 2. Statewide limits for handicapped children are so captioned when different limits apply.
3 Source: State Plan for Supportive Services.

ety of child care types and limiting the variation within each type, the 75th percentile of market rates captures about 95 percent of all rates, i.e., about 95 percent of the providers have their charges fully covered.

Funding for Child Care

The open-ended entitlement for child care under JOBS represents a potentially significant change in the availability of child care funding, provided states are able to generate the required state matching funds. With the exception of Texas noted earlier, administrators in all states expected to have sufficient funds for child care for enough JOBS participants to achieve the seven percent participation rates in 1990 and 1991. Since the introduction of JOBS in Maryland, however, child care has become problematic for some non-AFDC working poor who, although eligible for the state's subsidized child care program, had to be placed on a waiting list during the last quarter of 1990. As noted earlier, Minnesota experienced a similar problem in providing child care to some non-AFDC families in 1989. Minnesota solved its problem through several strategies, including restricting access to JOBS and appropriating additional child care funds. In both Maryland and Texas, some relief for these problematic child care situations is expected with the implementation of the recently enacted Child Care and Development Block Grant.

The introduction of JOBS had a significant impact on the availability of funding for child care in Texas. Prior to JOBS, the only funding source used for WIN participants was Title XX, and no state funding was available to match IV-A funds for child care. In the current state fiscal year, Texas has authorized $6.2 million in state funding for child care. This first-time provision of state funding for child care represents a significant departure from past state practices in child care.

Texas, along with Mississippi and Tennessee, appropriated relatively small amounts for additional funds for JOBS services. However, all three have given priority within the overall JOBS program to funding child care and other supportive services. In Tennessee, which appropriated no new funds for JOBS services, slightly over $2 million were allocated for child care for JOBS participants. This amounts to about $1000 for each of the 2,033 JOBS participants to be served, and it is expected to be sufficient to pay for an average of 20 weeks of child care.

As shown in Table 10, states are also accessing other funding sources to provide child care to JOBS participants. Six states are accessing Title XX funds to support child care for JOBS participants or for recipients to accept or maintain employment. However, in some instances these funds may be used primarily for those recipients needing child care to accept or maintain employment rather than for those participating in JOBS activities. In other instances, Title XX funds may be reserved for payments for specific types of child care arrangements. Some states are also setting priorities for the expenditure of these funds in relation to the JOBS program. In Tennessee, child care funded by Title XX is the first priority for placement; in Texas, it is the last. In New York, it is anticipated that Title XX funds will not usually be allocated to JOBS participants. These decisions appear to be related to both the availability of state matching funds for IV-A and to the other demands placed on Title XX funds (for example, funding for child protective services).

Another significant funding stream used by five of the states is JTPA Title II-A. The availability of these funds for child care varies among the relatively autonomous Private Industry Councils, however, as well as the state's cooperative arrangements with JTPA.

TABLE 10: Sources of Non-Reimbursable Child Care Services[1]

State	Funding Sources			
	Title XX	State Funds	Local Funds	JTPA
Maryland		Yes		Yes
Michigan	Yes	Yes		
Minnesota		Yes		
Mississippi				
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes			
Oregon		Yes		
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes		Yes
Tennessee	Yes			Yes
Texas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

1 Source: State Plans for Supportive Services.

Linkage to Early Childhood Education Programs

One strategy for maximizing both available funding and slots for child care is to develop linkages with existing early childhood education programs. Table 11 shows the linkages states have made to major early childhood education programs. Nine of the ten states have Head Start available as a non-reimbursable child care program. At this point in the development of state JOBS programs, however, Head Start along with the other programs do not appear to be important sources of child care services for JOBS participants. Limitations of these programs noted by state administrators include the fact that they are typically avail-

TABLE 11: Related Coordinated Programs for Child Care[1]

State	Head Start	Chapter 1[2]	Preschool Program For Handicapped Children	State Preschool For 4 Year Olds	State Preschool For 3 Year Olds
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Michigan	Yes	Yes			
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Mississippi					
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oregon	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Texas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

1 Source: State Plans for Supportive Services.
2 Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981.

able only during the school year and usually offer only one-half day of child care. Therefore, these programs leave significant gaps in child care coverage for JOBS participants. Although several states have taken steps to encourage full-day Head Start programs or an expansion of child care services in the public schools, these efforts usually have not been related to the implementation of JOBS. Rather, they reflect more general initiatives by the states regarding child care services.

Overall, the states have not introduced major initiatives to increase either the supply of, or access to, available child care programs on a non-reimbursable basis in conjunction with the implementation of JOBS. In part this is explained by the states' generally having access to an adequate amount of child care to meet the needs of JOBS participants at this point, as well as earlier efforts to access these child care programs for AFDC recipients.

Quality of Child Care

States have generally maintained their existing systems of child care licensing and regulation. However, the regulation of family day care services has received some attention in conjunction with the passage of the Family Support Act. For example, both Tennessee and Texas, drawing on funding provided for under Section 301 of the Family Support Act, have developed programs to register family day care homes. Indirectly, the registration of family day care homes may also increase the supply of child care services available to JOBS participants.

Recognizing that many family day care homes were not licensed, as legally required, New York has begun to streamline its licensing process for these providers. Family day care homes will now be registered without a prior on-site visit and assessment by the regulatory agency. Instead, providers will conduct a self-assessment of whether they meet the state regulations. The new provisions also require family day care home providers to attend training. In New York, these changes in the state regulatory process for family day care homes are expected by state administrators to increase the number of registered providers who will be accessible to JOBS participants. These changes, however, also reduce the extent of the state's oversight of family day care homes.

Child Care Brokers

Three states in the study have developed child care management systems to operate in conjunction with child care for JOBS and for transitional benefits. Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas have all established contracts with regionally based agencies to handle specific aspects of child care, including administration of child care payments and state and federal reporting. In Tennessee, the child care brokers handle transitional benefits and are expected to be subcontractors to the JTPA for handling JOBS-related child care. The child care broker system is supplemented by a statewide telephone child care resource and referral service.

In Texas, the broker agencies, whose catchment areas are congruent with the SDA boundaries, handle all licensed child care and deal with the multiple funding streams (except JTPA and other local funding sources) available to JOBS participants for child care. This system has increased the clients' choice of licensed providers; they are no longer restricted to Title XX providers. Additionally, the system is expected to facilitate the continuity of child care as clients progress toward increased levels of economic self-sufficiency. (For further information, see Langguth, 1991.)

The child care management system in Mississippi operates somewhat differently. Broker agencies in that state handle all child care payments, including payments for self-arranged care. Usually, however, personnel at the child care agency do not deal directly with either the client or the providers. They inform the client by mail of the three types of child care options available to them, and assistance is provided only if the client is unsuccessful in securing child care arrangements.

In both Texas and Pennsylvania, which operates a similar system as a demonstration project, the use of child care management agencies has resulted in a greater range of choices for JOBS participants in need of child care. The use of these broker agencies has generated political debate in both states, however, because Title XX agencies, which previously were guaranteed funding for some child care slots, now face increased levels of competition in the open market. It is interesting to note that Mississippi and Tennessee, which did not have well-developed welfare employment programs prior to JOBS, have not encountered this political issue.

Discussion

At the time of the field research, access to child care for JOBS participants was not a significant concern in implementing JOBS. In general, state administrators perceived both the supply of child care slots and funding for child care as adequate at that time. Some may regard this finding as somewhat unexpected, particularly given current information about the availability of child care in general. There are, however, several possible explanations for this finding. First, given the numbers of participants served at this point in implementing JOBS, states may well have allocated sufficient funding for child care, and the availability of child care services may be sufficient to meet the current demand. Second, states are now giving high priority to the enrollment of volunteers. It is possible that those volunteering for the JOBS program have fewer needs for child care than other potential JOBS participants. Third, recipients with significant needs for child care may be viewed as having barriers to program participation and thus may be less likely to be enrolled in JOBS activities. Given the need to serve only seven percent of the potential JOBS pool, states may be choosing to serve those with lower needs for child care—in effect, creaming on the basis of child care needs. Finally, it may also be that the availability of child care services is an issue faced more directly at the local level, and this will be considered in the next round of research.

There are, however, projections that as the participation rates increase, the likelihood of confronting inadequate funding for child care will also increase. Addressing this situation through increased allocations of state funds appears unlikely, at least in the short term, given the current fiscal constraints of most states. Alternative strategies, which some states are now pursuing, include closer coordination with early childhood development programs such as Head Start and increased access to alternative funding streams such as JTPA II-A. The new funding stream provided by the Child Care and Development Block Grant may also alleviate some of the demands on state IV-A funds for child care. Another alternative is to proceed as Minnesota has—restricting access to the JOBS program. However, the effectiveness of this strategy may well decrease as the participation rates climb toward 20 percent.

The multiple funding streams for child care, combined with the array of payment methods, varying payment amounts for different types of care in various locations, and the complex reporting requirements associated with each funding

source, create a high level of complexity in administering child care for JOBS participants. While most state agencies have chosen to continue administering this system directly, other states have chosen to contract out some or all of this administrative responsibility. Based on the states in this study, the use of child care brokers appears more likely to occur in states with less mature or long- standing welfare employment programs. These states may be less likely to confront well-established provider groups with vested interests in the existing system. The use of child care management systems merits closer attention and may offer an alternative model for administering the multiple child care funding streams while also providing important education and linkage services to parents.

OTHER SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND WORK-RELATED EXPENSES

For those states with less well-developed welfare employment programs, the provision of supportive services (other than child care) has increased under JOBS. Although not a pressing issue at the state level, transportation is recognized as a potential problem, particularly in rural areas. At this stage of implementation, states have not elected to use JOBS funds in any significant manner to provide new or expanded services to children.

The Family Support Act makes provisions for states to reimburse the costs of transportation, work-related expenses, and work-related supportive services, including supportive services to the children of JOBS participants. It is through these provisions, as well as others, that the Family Support Act offers the potential to serve vulnerable children and their families. Is the lack of transportation expected to limit JOBS participation? Has the emphasis given to the supportive service needs of JOBS participants and their children increased as a result of the JOBS legislation?

As specified by the federal regulations, the state is required to provide, pay for, or reimburse transportation and other work-related expenses which it determines are necessary for an individual to participate in JOBS activities, including approved self-initiated education or training programs. These expenses are federally reimbursable at the 50 percent matching rate, subject to the JOBS funding cap. The state may also opt to provide, pay for, or reimburse one-time, work-related expenses deemed necessary for an applicant or recipient to accept or maintain employment. Defining a one-time, work-related expense remains with the state. (Examples include uniforms, a set of tools, and fees for a driver's license.)

The act also requires the state to provide, pay for, or reimburse the costs of work-related supportive services if these are necessary for an individual to participate in JOBS. With the exception of child care services, states have complete discretion in determining if, and what, other supportive services will be provided. It is under this provision that children of participants may receive such services as drug education or life skills planning. Examples of supportive services other than child care include "counseling, medical and dental services, stand-alone courses in parenting or life skills training, day care for incapacitated adults, and substance abuse remediation" (*Federal Register*, 1989, p. 42219).

State Responses

We have examined supportive services (other than child care) as outlined in the states' supportive services plan within four broad categories: counseling, education, transportation, and medical services. As shown in Table 12, a number of states such as New York, Michigan, and Maryland have elected to offer a large variety of supportive services within these categories. For these states, as well as most of the other states with relatively well developed welfare employment programs prior to JOBS, this array of services does not represent any *major* additions to either the type of services available or the amount of funding allocated to these services. The exception is Oregon, which has increased its allocations for both transportation and work-related expenses.

The most significant changes in the provision of supportive services other than child care have occurred in Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas. In Tennessee, it is roughly estimated that there has been a 68 percent increase in the level of spending for other supportive services. Texas not only increased its funding for transportation, but also authorized funding for the first time for one-time work-related expenses. Mississippi, which continues to provide for work-related expenses as well as alcohol and substance abuse treatment, has increased the funding available for transportation.

Transportation, particularly in states with extensive rural areas, was identified as a potential problem in implementing JOBS, but at this point the extent of the problem and its impact upon JOBS participation is unknown. The data suggest, however, that transportation issues are associated primarily with service delivery in rural rather than urban areas. The issue for rural areas appears to be two-fold: a lack of available transportation services and inadequate monthly transportation allowances, given the transportation choices and the distances covered.

TABLE 12: Supportive Services (Other Than Child Care) for JOBS Participants Specified in the State Plan

Other Supportive Services	MD	MI	MN	MS	NY	OK	OR	PA	TN	TX
Counseling:										
Family services	A/C	A								
Drug/Alcohol abuse	A			A	A/C					
Academic, vocational, career		A			C					
Drug/Alcohol education, independent living, life skills			A[2]		A/C					
General counseling and/or crisis intervention	A	A			A/C					
Education:										
Tuition			Yes		Yes[1]					
Textbooks, fees, supplies	Yes (SIET)	Yes	Yes		Yes[1]			Yes		
Transportation:										
License, registration inspection							Yes	Yes		
Car purchase							Yes	Yes		
Car insurance	Yes				Yes		Yes			
Car repairs	Yes	Yes			Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	
Private/Public costs to/from worksite and childcare	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Medical:										
General medical		Yes								
Hearing aid	Yes									
Dental	Yes	Yes							Yes	
Optical	Yes		Yes						Yes	
Medical exam		A		A	C				A	

A/C: A=adult, C=child

1 Not for SIET (Self-Initiated Education and Training)
2 Life skills

Discussion

Although recognized as a potential problem, particularly in rural areas, transportation is currently not a pressing issue in implementing JOBS at the state level for the states included in this study. Only Minnesota acknowledged concerns about transportation issues. At this point in implementation, given the numbers of participants served by JOBS, most of the states may well have authorized sufficient funding to provide for transportation. Additionally, some states were operating JOBS on a limited basis during this round of field research, and it may be that the availability of transportation services in the states' JOBS areas is adequate to meet the needs of JOBS participants. As with child care, however, it is also possible that those recipients not having access to transportation are viewed as having a barrier to JOBS participation, and these recipients may be less likely to be enrolled in JOBS activities. At the seven percent level for participation, states may be able to choose to serve those with lower needs for transportation. Finally, it may also be that the lack of available transportation services or sufficient funding for transportation may be a problem more immediately confronted on the local level, and this will be examined in the next round of research.

Based on the states' plans for supportive services and the field information, the findings suggest that states, in general, have not elected to use JOBS funds in any significant manner to provide new or expanded supportive services to the children of participants, nor have the states taken any major initiatives to link families of JOBS participants to comprehensive family and children's services. This does not necessarily mean that children are not receiving services as a result of JOBS. States may in fact be drawing on other available community resources to address the needs of children as identified in the assessment and employability plan. The actual provision of supportive services to children of JOBS participants will be pursued in other phases of this study focusing on local service delivery.

VII

STATE CHOICES FOR CLIENT PROCESSING

For JOBS participants, entry into the program begins with an introduction to JOBS, followed by an initial assessment and the development of an employability plan. In completing these tasks, as well as in linking clients to their JOBS activities, case managers may play a pivotal role. In this section of the report, we present the field research findings regarding the states' choices and designs for introducing clients to the JOBS program, conducting the assessments, developing the employability plans, and structuring case management services. Issues related to client processing, such as establishing priority groups for services and the degree of mandated participation, are covered in section IX.

PROVIDING INFORMATION TO CLIENTS

All applicants and recipients are to be provided with information regarding the JOBS program and available supportive services. What policies have the states developed for providing this information to clients, and has the information been framed within the context of parental responsibility, as Congress intended?

State policies or guidelines for providing information regarding the JOBS program require the provision of written information to clients, usually supplemented by discussions with front-line workers. The state policies adhere to the federal regulations, but states have not undertaken any major initiatives to emphasize parental responsibility as including both JOBS and child support obligations.

The state agency is required to provide all applicants and recipients, at the time of application or redetermination, with information regarding the JOBS program and supportive services, as well as the responsibilities and rights of the agency and the participant. Additionally, information must be provided at the same time regarding the establishment of paternity and the enforcement of child support obligations.

The content of this information is specified in detail in both the legislation and the regulations. This information must include the education, training, and employment opportunities available through JOBS; supportive services including child care, transitional child care, transitional health care, and other work-related services; and the rights, responsibilities, and obligations of the participants, including the grounds for exemptions and the consequences for non-compliance. The agency is required to provide directly, or through other agencies, detailed information regarding child care services, including the types and locations of child care services accessible to the client and the assistance available to select and to obtain child care services.

The means of providing the required information are at the discretion of the state. Therefore, states have flexibility regarding the dissemination of this information and the extent to which it becomes a part of the eligibility determination process. Additionally, the states retain discretion in determining the format for providing this information. The preamble to the regulations suggests, however, that both the purpose and the packaging of this information is to take on a new form:

> What is new is the intent of Congress to have both subjects [JOBS and child support] discussed in the context of parental responsibility to support children. Although the means to achieve that end are embodied in two different programs, the purpose of each is to reinforce the notion of parental responsibility (*Federal Register*, 1989, p. 42177).

The State Response

Most of the study states have developed policies or guidelines for their local agencies to follow in providing information on JOBS to welfare recipients. In most cases, the states require that the local offices provide applicants and recipients with written information on the JOBS program and its services. Frequently, the state envisions that this written information will be supplemented by the front-line workers at the initial intake, during the eligibility redetermination process, and during a separate orientation for the JOBS program. The written information provided by the states parallels that called for by the federal regulations. In some states, videotapes have been produced to supplement written materials and discussions with front-line workers. In Oregon and Tennessee, particular emphasis is given to both parental responsibility and the opportunities available to clients under the JOBS program.

Discussion

State policies clearly adhere to the requirements for providing information to clients called for by the federal legislation and regulations. However, it does not appear that these requirements have caused state agencies to engage in any extensive initiatives to emphasize parental responsibility in the context of both the JOBS program and child support obligations. In addition, these informational requirements do not appear to be viewed by most states in the study as major vehicles for the recruitment of clients into the JOBS program.

An additional issue to consider is when, as well as how often, to present information regarding JOBS. Both the concerns of the clients and the data collection demands already in place for the initial determination of eligibility suggest that the effectiveness of providing information regarding the JOBS program during the initial application may be limited. Mississippi has taken an approach that requires the provision of JOBS information at different points in time. The state expects information about the JOBS program to be provided by both the eligibility workers at the initial eligibility determination and again by the JOBS case manager at a later point in the client's exposure to JOBS.

ASSESSMENTS AND EMPLOYABILITY PLANS

Within broad parameters, states are required to conduct assessments and develop employability plans for clients prior to participation in JOBS. What do the state agencies envision as the purpose of the assessment, and to what extent are the needs of a participant's children considered?

Seven of the ten states view the assessment as a comprehensive gathering of information used to design the employability plan. In contrast, Oregon and Pennsylvania use the initial assessment to determine the level of the client's job readiness. For clients entering selected program tracks, a more complete assessment is completed in these states. Texas also tracks clients, but uses a screening to do so; assessments are conducted after a client is assigned to a service track. With the possible exceptions of Minnesota and New York, states have not elected to use the assessment process as an opportunity to identify and consider the special needs of children.

Prior to participation in JOBS, an initial assessment must be made of each participant's employability. As specified in the legislation, this assessment must include the participant's educational, child care, and other supportive services needs; the participant's skills, prior work experience, and employability; and a review of the family circumstances. At state option, an assessment may also be made of the needs of any child of the participant as well as other factors regarded as important to developing an employability plan.

Based on the initial assessment, the state agency is required to develop an employability plan in consultation with the participant. This plan must take into account available program resources, the participant's preferences, the participant's supportive services needs, her skill level and aptitudes, and local employment opportunities. The employability plan must contain an employment goal and describe the supportive services to be provided by the agency, the participant's JOBS activities, and any other needs of the family that might be met by JOBS.

The states retain wide latitude in determining both the methods and the process for completing the initial assessment. States may choose to conduct the assessment through interviews, testing, counseling, self-assessment instruments, and other means. States may also select the process for completing the initial assessments. For example, the preamble to the federal regulations suggests that an agency "may find it more cost-effective to do a limited, initial assessment...followed by a more in-depth assessment only as participant needs dictate" (*Federal Register*, 1989, p. 42178). In this section, the states' designs and expectations for the assessment process and the development of employability plans are considered.

The purposes of the initial assessments differ among the states. In Oregon and Pennsylvania, an initial assessment is viewed as a method to determine the level of the client's job readiness and to track clients into appropriate service levels. In the other states, the assessment is viewed as a comprehensive gathering of information regarding the client's strengths and weaknesses, as well as barriers to employment, in order to design an appropriate service plan for employability. Administrators in several states in the study, in particular Minnesota, Oregon, and Texas, recognized that the assessment needs to be an ongoing process used to develop and revise service plans as needed.

Tiered Approaches

Two of the states included in this study have elected to use tiered assessments for their JOBS programs. In Oregon, local welfare staff are expected to conduct an initial assessment of those eligible for AFDC benefits. This initial assessment pro-

vides the basis for tracking clients to the appropriate JOBS track. On the basis of the initial assessment, an employability plan is developed by the case manager and the participant. For those who are not job-ready, a more in-depth assessment is to be conducted through the client's participation in the Workplace Basics Component of the JOBS program. This more in-depth assessment is expected to be an ongoing, dynamic process that may lead to the revision or modification of the employability plan. For an estimated 90 percent of the participants, this more informal, but in-depth assessment is expected to be sufficient. The remaining 10 percent may need additional vocational assessment based on standardized instruments and an analysis of supportive service needs.

A tiered approach is also used in Pennsylvania. The initial assessment is to be conducted by the public welfare intake worker to determine job readiness. For those entering the more intensive JOBS program (SPOC), a more comprehensive assessment is to be conducted by the case management team, which includes the public welfare, job service, and JTPA staff. Texas tracks clients into various services based on an initial screening; the assessments are done once the client has entered one of three service levels.

Agency Roles

Local public welfare staff are expected to play key roles in completing the assessment and employability plans in six states in the study. In three of the states in the study, however, contractors for JOBS are expected to play central roles in completing the assessments and employability plans. In Minnesota, Mississippi, and Tennessee, the primary contractor for JOBS assumes responsibility for the assessments and employability plans. In Texas, assessments and employability plans are to be completed after the clients have been screened and assigned to service levels. The agency responsible for the assessments and employability plans differs for each level. Those who are most job-ready are to be assessed by the contractors providing employment services. For those the agency views as having employment barriers amenable to intervention, the local welfare case manager is expected to perform the assessment and complete the employability plan. For those identified as having barriers well in excess of the agency's resources to remedy, local staff below the level of case manager may be designated to conduct assessments and employability plans. Given resource limitations, it is expected that few clients in this last category will be provided these services.

Methods

The method for completing the assessment in most of the study states is through interviews conducted by front-line workers and may include some standardized testing. A number of states have developed model instruments or guidelines for the content to be covered in these interviews. Self-administered instruments are used as supplements to the assessment process in two states. In Pennsylvania, a self-administered instrument is used in the initial assessment for job readiness. Oklahoma uses a three-page self-assessment instrument that is regarded as a useful technique for also evaluating basic literacy. In some cases, performance on the self-assessment instrument can lead to further testing through client referral to the educational system.

Literacy and Computational Skills

Screening for literacy and computational skills is part of the initial assessment for all clients in four of the states (Maryland, Mississippi, New York, and Oregon).

New York requires that the local service districts complete an assessment of literacy within one year following the initial assessment. In Texas and Pennsylvania, the clients who have received service priority are to be screened for literacy skills. All but one of these states have elected to use standardized tests in conducting literacy screening. However, the specific test used may vary across the state.

Attention to the Needs of Children

With several exceptions, state agencies do recognize the importance of including the supportive service needs of family members in both the assessment and employability plan. In some instances, these needs are considered only if they are regarded as a barrier to participation. Among the states, Minnesota and New York most clearly recognize the needs of children in conjunction with the assessment. New York requires that local districts review any special needs of the child during the assessment. In Minnesota, the assessment must take into account the results of testing through preschool or the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment programs, if either is available. Additionally, for a custodial parent under 18 years of age, the assessment must include a review the effect of any child's developmental and educational needs on the parent's ability to participate in the program. (For a discussion of Minnesota's minor mothers initiative, see Wattenberg, 1991.) In one state, however, little consideration has been given to children in the initial assessment because

> state officials feel that these issues are dealt with through the exemption of mothers with children younger than three, the relatively easy access to child care support, the case management system, and the programs associated with JOBS that serve young people (Field Associate Report).

Client's Preferences

The federal legislation and the regulations indicate that the employability plan is to be developed in consultation with the participant and reflect the participant's preferences "to the maximum extent possible" (45 CFR 250.41(b)(2)(v)). The methods for providing participants the opportunity to influence and to have substantive input into the employability plan are unspecified and must be developed by the states. The states in this study addressed clients' interests and goals by considering them in the assessment. New York requires that the employability plan include a justification if clients' preferences cannot be accommodated. No other approaches to accommodating, or recognizing an inability to accommodate, the clients' preferences were identified.

Discussion

In general, states have established procedures and guidelines for the process and content of assessment and employability plans that closely follow those mandated by the federal legislation or regulations. In most of the study states, the content delineated for the assessment provides basic information on the client's background and barriers to employment. Some states, however, envision a more comprehensive assessment for JOBS participants. The model developed by Mississippi attends not only to the client's educational levels and work experience, but also includes the client's "dreams" and goals, her support system, and related areas that highlight the client's strengths, hopes, and aspirations. Another model is Oregon's assessment and employability plan for young parents, which is described below.

In implementing the requirements for assessments and employability plans, wide discretion is retained by local providers, whether they are situated in the welfare agency or another agency. In some instances, this discretion has been included in the state's vision of JOBS or has occurred because of limitations on state authority to mandate procedures. In other instances, the discretion results from the nature of the work itself. At least one of the study states has recognized its lack of control over and information about assessments and employability plans and is now developing a local monitoring protocol to follow the implementation of assessment and employability plans at the local levels. The discretion retained by front-line workers will be considered in the next phase of this study.

An issue for both the assessment and the employability plans is the extent to which they are regarded as flexible, subject to change and revision as needs and circumstances change. Will the assessment be an ongoing process? Will the employability plan be a working or a static document? Among the states in this study, Minnesota, Oregon, and Texas have envisioned the assessment as an ongoing, dynamic process, and Oregon has recognized the need to view the employability plan as a modifiable one, subject to ongoing review. However, some state administrators noted that the federal regulations provide a disincentive for taking this approach to assessments and employability plans because these activities may be included for only one month in determining the state's participation rate (45 CFR 250.78).

The initial assessment phase offers states the opportunity to identify and consider any special needs of children. By incorporating the needs of participants' children into the assessment, and subsequently into the employability plan, JOBS offers the potential for becoming a two-generational program. At the time of this study, the findings suggest that although states acknowledge the importance of children's needs, only New York and Minnesota have emphasized this potential opportunity. New York requires that the assessment for all clients include consideration of any special needs of the child, and Minnesota requires the inclusion of results from testing for preschool or the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment program, if either is available. In addition, the state agency in Oregon places particular emphasis on maternal and child health in a special program for young parents. Whether this opportunity to consider children's needs is realized at the local level will be considered in the examination of local sites.

Program Highlight

In Oregon, highly individualized services are being developed at the local level for young parents, ages 16 to 19, who have not completed high school or the equivalent. The strategy is intended to provide individualized attention, advocacy, and support to teen parents to complete their education and to develop the attitudes, behaviors, and skills necessary for the teen parent to benefit from participating in additional JOBS program activities once she has completed her high school education. Local service districts are encouraged to provide counseling and intervention services through the local school district or other local programs for at-risk youth. The state guidelines for the initial assessment of the teen parent are comprehensive and include grade level completion, functional abilities in reading and math, health of the mother and child(ren), potential participation barriers, child care and alternate child care arrangements, family planning strategies, preliminary occupational interests and skills, relationships with other family members (including the male partner) and their support for or opposition to program

participation, and supportive service needs. The individual service plan must be completed within two weeks from the date of enrollment and should include both long and short-term goals. The plan must address the following: high school completion or equivalent, maternal and child health goals, parenting skills development, family planning, supportive service needs, career exploration and employability development, and skills training.

These intensive services for young parents are regarded by the state as having been highly successful. At the start of this program, there were 1,986 young parents receiving AFDC benefits, of whom 642 were not required to attend school because they had a high school education or were otherwise exempt. Of the 1,305 required to attend school, 925 (71 percent) were in attendance by October 1, 1990, and an additional 60 were on waiting lists. The state estimates that of the 925 young parents in school, 814 (88 percent) were in attendance because of the intervention provided through the state's young parents program.

CASE MANAGEMENT

Case management is an optional service under JOBS and may be provided to both the participant and her family. Have states elected to offer case management services, and what model of case management is being used?

Nine states offer case management services, with most of these using a generalist model of case management in which one person fulfills all the case management functions. Maryland and Pennsylvania have opted to use a team approach to case management that involves front-line workers from several agencies. The only state not officially providing case management is Oklahoma. However, its approach to integrating income maintenance and social services functions suggests that case management services, as commonly defined, are in fact being provided to JOBS participants in the state.

The federal legislation allows states to provide case management services as part of their JOBS programs. These services may be provided to both the participant and her family, and they are reimbursable at the enhanced rate of 60 percent or higher. If case management services are provided, the case manager "must be responsible for assisting the family to obtain any services which may be needed to assure effective participation in the program" (42 USC 682 (b) (3)). The regulations allow states choosing case management flexibility in designing their case management systems, including procedures and services. Comments in the final federal regulations recognize that states may have reasons, including cost, for not electing to offer case management services or to offer them on a limited basis.

Case management is a term that lacks specific definition and is applied to a wide variety of practice approaches (Rapp and Chamberlain, 1985). Traditionally, case management has included responsibility for service coordination, service continuity, and for connecting clients with services to which they are entitled. Case management is now generally conceptualized as containing at least five functions: assessment, case planning, linkage to services, monitoring of services and client's progress, and advocacy (see Johnson and Rubin, 1983; Rubin, 1987; and Blazyk et al., 1987). Other commonly recognized functions of case management are outreach, resource development, crisis intervention, and direct provision of therapeutic services.

Given this range of functions, a variety of case management models have been developed that may be conceptualized along a continuum. At one end is the case manager as "broker" assuming responsibility for linking the client to needed services. In this model, there is relatively little client contact and the case manager is

viewed as performing primarily a clerical function. At the other end is the case manager as "primary therapist" who has responsibility for the treatment of the client as well as the case management (Rapp and Chamberlain, 1985). Another conceptualization of case management is that of a "team" in which each team member has responsibility for service activities in her or his areas of expertise. "In combination, the activities of these specialized case managers constitute a complete case management process" (Weil, 1985, p. 48).

This section surveys the states' approaches to case management services in conjunction with serving JOBS participants and their families in JOBS activities. Several states are using a variation of case management in providing child care assistance to JOBS participants. The use of child care "brokers" is covered separately in the discussion of child care services.

Nine of the states included in the study have chosen to offer case management services under their JOBS programs. In seven of these states, case management services had been part of the states' earlier employment and training programs. For Tennessee and Mississippi, the introduction of case management was tied directly to the introduction of the states' JOBS programs and represents a new direction in the states' welfare employment programs.

Generalist Model

Across the states, case management refers to a variety of approaches and services, and some states use more than one model of case management, depending on the intensity of the specific JOBS program. For states such as Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Oregon, and Texas, a generalist model of case management is being used and includes such commonly identified case management functions as conducting the assessment, developing the employability plan, linking clients to required services, supportive counseling, and monitoring client participation and progress in program components. Mississippi, Oregon, and Texas explicitly recognize the advocacy function of case management as well. In Oregon, additional functions which are performed by case managers are the determination or redetermination of AFDC eligibility.

Tennessee and Mississippi, which are introducing case management into their welfare employment programs for the first time, have taken somewhat different approaches to their development. Tennessee is currently pilot testing several models of case management, and the state expects to phase in limited case management by October 1, 1991. At this point, functions that other states have either placed in one agency or linked across agencies by building teams are being performed in three systems without an integrating framework: the local eligibility worker; the JTPA staff and the staff of JTPA contractors who provide assessments, complete employability plans, provide counseling, and monitor participation; and the child care broker agencies.

Mississippi's state agency has selected a generalist model for case management that envisions the case manager as a "client partner" who will advocate on the client's behalf and will also have the power to requisition across agency boundaries the services and resources required by the client. The envisioned role of the case manager is an unusually comprehensive one, and the state has required that it must be filled by a licensed social worker. Organizationally, case managers are housed in the local community action agency and provide case management services through a contractual arrangement with the state welfare agency.

A key variable in the ability of case managers to fulfill these generalist functions, as well as in the intensity of case management services, is caseload size. In states using the generalist model, only Minnesota and Oregon have limited caseload size or encouraged its restriction.

Team Approaches

Two states have chosen a team approach to case management. In Pennsylvania, the emphasis is on creating a team of specialized workers who cooperate in providing services to clients. The team model differs, however, for the two tracks of the JOBS program. For the low intensity track called New Directions, the case management functions are filled sequentially, as needed by the client, by three types of income maintenance workers: intake, ongoing eligibility, and employment and training workers. In addition to eligibility determination functions, the intake worker also assumes responsibility for performing a preliminary evaluation of the job-readiness of clients and for referring job-ready clients to the Job Service. The ongoing eligibility worker is responsible for eligibility redeterminations, determinations of "good cause" should a client fail to participate, and sanctioning procedures. The employment and training workers perform those functions commonly associated with case management in other states.

For the more intensive Single-Point-of-Contact program in Pennsylvania, the case management team is called the Direct Service Team and is comprised of three members, one each from the SDA (JTPA), the County Assistance Office, and the Job Service. The Direct Service Team is a formally constituted group that meets on a regular basis to plan and monitor client progress. Jointly, the team assumes responsibility for the assessment and for developing the employability plan. Primary responsibility for a client case then rotates among the members of the team, depending on the client's status. In general, the County Assistance Office member would have responsibility for advocacy, counseling, and arranging supportive services in the initial stages of client involvement in the program. During training, primary responsibility would shift to the JTPA member. Following training, the Job Service member would assume responsibility for job placement-related functions. Caseloads for the SPOC case management program are restricted to 50 cases.

Maryland, a state-supervised system, has elected to encourage a team approach to case management based on cooperative arrangements between the local department of social services and the employment and training agency or the local education agency, as appropriate for the client's service needs. The case management team becomes operational when the client is enrolled in educational or training activities, and its purpose is to deal with required changes in a service plan or to plan interventions for any problems that may develop in implementing the plan. Local departments of social services can determine their own allocation of staff to case management functions. They are permitted to offer two types of case management: transitional or intensive. Both offer the same types of services, i.e., initial assessment, supportive counseling, and some assistance in obtaining resources. However, intensive case managers are assigned smaller caseloads and are expected to assist hard-to-place clients through more intensive services.

Focus of Services

Some states have tended to focus case management services on either selected client populations or selected JOBS service tracks. For example, New York, a state-supervised system, requires that local districts offer to provide case manage-

ment services for any pregnant adolescent or any adolescent custodial parent under 18 at the time he or she is referred to the state's Teenage Services Act program, regardless of his or her status as a JOBS participant. New York also identifies four other priority groups which must receive case management if resources permit: at-risk youth, persons in the JOBS target groups, JOBS participants needing two or more concurrent activities, and JOBS participants with limited English proficiency. Minnesota, which continues to view case management as a central component in its welfare-to-work program, offers case management to federal target group members who volunteer for JOBS and to 18- and 19-year-old custodial parents required to attend school.

Texas, which has reintroduced case management under JOBS, provides different levels of case management services depending on the service level: clients without significant barriers to employment receive limited case management services, whereas clients with significant barriers to employment receive no case management services. For clients in the middle range—those with nine to eleven years of education and no other significant employment barriers—case management services may be delivered if resources permit. As noted above, Pennsylvania provides more intensive case management services in its SPOC program, and caseloads are limited.

Integrating Income Maintenance and Social Services: Another Approach?

Oklahoma, the only state in the study not electing case management, has for many years integrated the income maintenance and social service functions into a single role for the front-line worker. As the Oklahoma field associate noted, "It would appear that a considerable degree of case oversight and management is achieved under the current arrangement of an integrated income maintenance and social service role."

In addition to eligibility determinations and redeterminations, the responsibility of the case workers includes many of the functions associated with case management in other states: completion of the assessment and employability plan, assistance in arranging child care, and implementing the employability plan. This latter would entail linking the client to other services and monitoring client participation and progress. Other staff called job developers have responsibility for establishing and maintaining community contacts supporting education, training, and employment activities. Job developers consult with and assist both caseworkers and participants and perform such functions as work preparation, group orientations, and supervised job search activities. Oklahoma's model of integrating eligibility and service functions, combined with the designated responsibilities of its workers, suggests that case management services are in fact being provided to JOBS participants in the state.

Discussion

A potential issue confronting states in their use of case managers is the difficulty of balancing the need for high levels of client contact and associated supportive counseling against the demands for data entry and reports on client participation and child care and supportive services payments. If caseload size and information processing assigned to case managers are not carefully monitored, case managers may be unable to fulfill the roles envisioned for them, particularly individualizing service planning, providing ongoing supportive service to clients, and maintaining service continuity for client participation. At least one state ad-

ministrator suspected that a decline in JOBS participation over the state's pre-JOBS welfare employment program was related, in part, to the increased reporting requirements introduced by JOBS and assigned to case managers. These increased reporting requirements were decreasing the amount of time case managers had available to serve clients, and thus program enrollments had fallen off.

Some states have identified case management as a strategy, or the main strategy, for providing integrated services in a timely and continuous fashion. The ability of case managers to perform these functions will be dependent on the size of the caseloads, the system demands for reporting, and the availability as well as accessibility of resources in the JOBS programs and the local community. Examination of these issues will be important in reviewing the local implementation of JOBS.

Program Highlight

The Michigan Opportunity System, an attempt to integrate all of the state's 70 different employment and training programs through a common interactive computer hook-up, held promise for not only facilitating client participation in services, but also for developing the role of the case manager as the coordinator and broker of services. Objectives for this system included allowing the case manager to know at any point the availability of services for clients, "empowering" the case manager to requisition services and resources across agency lines, and providing a single automated reporting system. Such a system would have greatly enhanced the boundary-spanning function of the case manager and increased the authority of the case manager, which some argue "is the most critical factor influencing the effectiveness of case management" (Rubin, 1987, pp. 216–217). The impetus for the Michigan Opportunity System rests in the Office of the Governor. With the change of administrations in Michigan and the fiscal constraints facing the state, the future of this initiative is unclear.

VIII

MEETING THE FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Family Support Act requires substantial data reporting by the states to the Department of Health and Human Services for the JOBS program and related child care provisions. To provide the required information, as well as to effectively operate JOBS programs, it is expected that automated, client-based information will be needed. What is the capacity of the states' current management information systems for responding to these new reporting requirements, and what challenges are presented to the states?

Although most states had adequate information systems for data collection and reporting demands prior to JOBS, no state's current information system had the capacity to respond adequately to the new reporting requirements. The states are facing major challenges in collecting the required information on JOBS participation and in the design and development of JOBS automated systems for the electronic transfer of information.

For the JOBS program and the related child care provisions, the Family Support Act requires substantial data reporting by the states to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). These expanded data reporting requirements are justified on the basis of explicit or implicit informational requirements contained in the legislation, including the uniform reporting requirements, the mandated rates of participation, and the mandate for targeted expenditures.

To provide the types of information required, as well as to effectively operate JOBS programs, HHS believes that states will need an automated, client-based information system, which is referred to as a state's JOBS Automated System (JAS) in order to distinguish it from other welfare data systems. States have the option of integrating JAS with their existing or planned IV-A system. Federal matching funds are available for JAS and states are allowed a phase-in period until October 1991 to come into complete compliance with the data requirements of the legislation.

Three kinds of data reporting are required by the federal regulations for the JOBS program: monthly aggregated reports of JOBS participation, monthly unaggregated JOBS case records (in the form of a random sample with a precision of plus or minus two percentage points at a 5 percent confidence interval), and JOBS expenditure data.

The information to be submitted to the HHS is extensive, including the type and cost of child care for each JOBS participant, the participant's literacy level, and the beginning and ending dates of participation in JOBS components. It also includes such data as the client's date of birth, age of youngest child, the number of months out of the previous 60 months that the client received AFDC payments, and job status. While states had until October 1991 to submit these data electronically to HHS, they were required to submit hardcopy reports on selected items in the interim.

While most states had an existing welfare management information system (automated, manual, or mixed) that provided support for the data collection and reporting demands of welfare programs prior to JOBS, no state operated an information system capable of meeting the JOBS requirements (see also APWA, 1990). Today, states confront two major challenges presented by the data reporting requirements for JOBS. First, many states encounter serious problems trying to collect the information required by HHS for the quarterly reports of JOBS participation. Second, most states confront various obstacles in the design and development of a JOBS Automation System to electronically transmit data to HHS by October 1991.

Current Status of Management Information Systems for JOBS

No state in this study was able to meet all federal reporting requirements for JOBS as of January 1991. Maryland, Oregon, and Oklahoma were ready to set their JAS in motion, but four other states (Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Texas) anticipated being unable to fully meet JOBS data reporting requirements. Mississippi was uncertain of its ability to meet the requirements because it needed to establish an automated system for the first time. Table 13 provides a summary of the reported status of welfare information systems for the 10 states as of January 1991.

The information systems in Maryland, Oklahoma, and Oregon were considered by administrators as adequate for JOBS. All three systems operated with an integrated system configuration, which enables the states to have on-line information sharing within the welfare agency. The systems in Maryland and Oregon were also able to provide on-line information sharing among related state agencies or JOBS partners.

TABLE 13: Reported Status of State Welfare Information Systems as of January 1991

State	Reporting Methods[1]	System Configuration[2]	On-Line Information Sharing Across Agencies	JAS in Place[3]
Maryland	Automated	Integrated	Yes	Yes
Michigan	Mixed	Subsystems	No	No
Minnesota	Mixed	Subsystems	No	No
Mississippi	Manual	Not Applicable	No	No
New York	Automated	Subsystems	No	No
Oklahoma	Automated	Integrated	No	Yes
Oregon	Mixed	Integrated	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Automated	Subsystems	No	No
Tennessee	Mixed	Subsystems	No	No
Texas	Mixed	Subsystems	No	No

1 Either an automated data reporting method, a manual data reporting method, or mixed.
2 Either a single integrated reporting system that permits on-line information sharing within the agency or one that relies on independent subsystems.
3 A JOBS Automated System was in place as of January 1991.

The management information systems for JOBS in Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas operated with independent subsystems. That is, none of the four systems provided on-line information sharing among the subsystems within the welfare agency. Often, each subsystem is designed to handle information of a particular operational process, such as eligibility determination. Moreover, no on-line information sharing was provided across agencies, e.g., between welfare and JTPA or education by any of the four systems. This lack of on-line information sharing results in reliance on a mixture of manual and automated methods in data collecting and reporting. These management information systems were considered by people running the systems to be "cumbersome" and "technically too complicated to be useful," as well as frequently requiring duplication of effort in data entry.

These four states have invested time and effort in upgrading their management information systems to meet JOBS data reporting requirements. The Department of Human Services in Minnesota has requested $680,000 from the 1990–1991 legislature for the biennium (State Fiscal Years 1992–93) to establish a JAS by upgrading and improving the existing management information system. Tennessee plans to update its JTPA information system to handle JOBS data requirements, Pennsylvania is replacing its existing management information system with a Control Data Corporation system, and Texas has devoted thousands of hours in staff time to develop a new design for JOBS. As of January 1991, none of these information systems was operative. As the four states look to the future in meeting the reporting requirements, Texas has expressed serious doubts about its ability to have the system effectively operative by October 1991. Minnesota stresses a number of major difficulties faced by the state. However, both Pennsylvania and Tennessee are more confident that their systems will be functional.

In New York, state administrators believe that their management information system for welfare programs prior to JOBS was one of the most sophisticated and extensive in the country. However, the state has encountered serious problems in meeting the JOBS data reporting requirements. There are two major constraints with the existing system. First, the system has four separate subsystems. None of the subsystems is adequate to provide the extensive information required by JOBS, and there is no on-line information sharing among the subsystems. Second, over the years, the state's management information system has reached its maximum capacity. Adding the large amount of new data elements required by JOBS will necessitate a major overhaul of the system. Faced with the current fiscal difficulty in New York, the state administrators are not optimistic about completing this task.

In Michigan and Mississippi, state administrators considered their management information systems unsatisfactory. While Michigan operates an antiquated information system, Mississippi has yet to develop an information system that employs computers. As of January 1991, all data collection was completed manually in Mississippi. Providing reports to HHS in a timely manner and setting up a JAS are, and will continue to be, serious problems for both states.

JOBS Automated Systems (JAS)

As of January 1991, Oregon, Oklahoma, and Maryland had a JAS in place. In Maryland, state officials estimated that approximately $660,000 was spent on hardware to set up the JAS and that $500,000 will be spent annually to support data managers. Maryland does regard its new system as effective for JOBS. Oregon converted its prior system to the JOBS Automated System. Since all JOBS

partners are sharing the JAS, data are centrally collected and stored. The information system used in Oklahoma's WIN Demonstration program is now used for the state's JOBS program. No substantial changes have been made. The county offices enter JOBS activities on a monthly basis via electronic entry to the state system. Unlike the automated information systems in Maryland and Oregon, the state's information system does not provide on-line information sharing across cooperating agencies.

Although it is still too early for these three states to evaluate their JAS, there are substantial differences in their outlook on JAS. While Maryland expressed confidence in its JAS, Oregon has major concerns. Oregon's JAS was converted from an older system, which had presented maintenance difficulties and which was never totally on-line and operative. Oklahoma state officials believe that the potential of the JAS is only partially being realized. The state is actively planning for in-service training to facilitate the use of the JAS among welfare workers.

Discussion

Although states are in various stages of complying with the federal JOBS data reporting requirements, a number of common concerns face the states. First, although states received preliminary information in November 1990, HHS was unable to finally specify the format and elements of JOBS data reporting requirements until March 28, 1991. As states planned their information systems, they confronted a lack of explicit federal guidelines, particularly those that regulate the electronic transmission of data. Uncertainty about the federal guidelines created a "Catch-22" situation for states. Anticipating major changes in the final requirements, some states were reluctant to commit their already scarce resources to major modifications of their existing management information system. Meanwhile, however, these states are unable to meet the current federal JOBS reporting requirements, because the federal reporting requirements are geared toward an automated information system. Other states have already transformed their information system into JAS. These states ran the risk of having to make substantial alterations to their established JAS once they received the final guidance from HHS.

Second, state administrators were concerned about the high cost associated with the system changes required by JOBS. This concern was especially shared by states with relatively large welfare caseloads and an existing, complex management information system. To meet the JOBS data reporting requirements, a substantial amount of human and financial resources must be committed to the information system. For example, Minnesota officials list lack of staff to work specifically on this area as one of the major difficulties they face in meeting JOBS data reporting requirements. The problem is further compounded by the fact that many states are experiencing fiscal stress. As one information systems manager observed, "[i]t is clear that this agency cannot afford [making the changes] without making sacrifices on other more client-beneficial areas."

A third area of concern related to more operational and technical issues as management information systems become more sophisticated and automated, especially due to JOBS data reporting requirements. One issue is staff training and retraining—new technologies associated with automation of information systems require ongoing staff training and retraining that few welfare agencies believe they could handle with ease. For example, Texas has just completed a "comprehensive revamping" of its management information system. The operating manual

for this new system was inches thick, requiring significant training to make this system operative.

Another issue involves the validity of the data collected and entered into the information system. Administrators expressed concern that welfare staff have already been working under high pressures, with large caseloads and not enough time to insure accuracy. With JOBS data reporting requirements, welfare staff will be asked to collect more information from each of their clients.

A final issue concerns the complexity of the information system. Already, some states have claimed that their systems were not user friendly. The management information systems for JOBS or JAS, with its expected potential to transmit information electronically across subsystems within the agency, across agencies within the state, and to the federal government, requires a major shift in the conceptualization of information management, a shift that will challenge even the most sophisticated state information systems. Unfortunately, for most states, there exists a real gap between the demands caused by JOBS and the current computer proficiency of state welfare agencies.

Program Highlight: MIS and Correction Action

Oklahoma's management information system for JOBS has played an important role in the state's JOBS implementation. JOBS activities are entered by the county offices into the state information system on a monthly basis via electronic entry. This allows the state's JOBS administrators to determine performance at the county level in achieving JOBS goals with considerable precision. Central to the system are state-set goals for each county-level office. County-level goals are set by making a determination of the number of JOBS participants in the system at the beginning of the fiscal year and projecting the percentage of participants expected to enter employment statewide. Each month, the state sends its county offices printouts of persons in all program components. These printouts indicate the participation rate and the percent of persons in program components who are in the target groups. This information allows the counties to make adjustments in their programming to meet the federal mandates for participation rates and targeting of expenditures.

IX

PARTICIPATION IN JOBS

Within the Family Support Act, participation is a multi-dimensional concept that places expectations on both the state and the recipient—the state to make JOBS activities and supportive services available, with a special focus on serving those at high-risk for long-term welfare dependency; the recipient to actively participate in JOBS activities in order to become economically self-sufficient. Participation thus becomes an expression of the mutual obligation underlying the legislation. For the purpose of analysis, we have separated participation into two broad areas, which are discussed in this section. The first area addresses the states' choices for prioritizing clients for JOBS services and the extent to which program participation is viewed as voluntary or mandatory. The second area considers the federal mandates requiring states to meet or exceed specific participation rates and to spend at least 55 percent of their JOBS expenditures on selected target groups.

PARTICIPATION IN JOBS: MANDATORY VERSUS VOLUNTARY

Although participation is nominally mandatory for all non-exempt recipients under the Family Support Act, resource limitations have led states to set policies that make participation voluntary for many of them. Tennessee and, with a few exceptions, Minnesota have an official policy of limiting enrollment in JOBS to volunteers. The majority of the other states give high priority to volunteers or to volunteers within the target groups. At this stage in program implementation, administrators do not view the threat of sanctions as a major strategy for encouraging program participation

The recipient's obligation to participate in JOBS is not well defined by the Family Support Act, which contains language consistent with both mandatory and voluntary participation. In setting policies for enrolling participants in JOBS and encouraging their ongoing participation, how did states strike a balance between the mandatory and voluntary elements in JOBS?

JOBS is nominally mandatory for all AFDC recipients who are not exempt due to illness, incapacity, or other specific reasons. The Family Support Act specifies that states must require all non-exempt AFDC recipients to participate in JOBS, provided that child care is available, that the program operates in the political subdivision, and that resources permit. States must sanction non-exempt AFDC recipients who fail to participate without "good cause." The requirement that states impose sanctions makes participation in JOBS mandatory from the perspective of the recipient.

The Act recognizes that state resources may be sufficient to serve only a fraction of non-exempt recipients and permits them to set priorities for participation. In setting these priorities, a state's JOBS program may become voluntary. The Act specifies that,

in determining the priorities for participation by individuals from among the target groups, the state must give first consideration to applicants or recipients who volunteer for the program. In addition, if the targeting requirements cannot be met, states need not require or even allow participation of people outside the target groups. Finally, individuals who are exempt from participation in JOBS must be allowed to volunteer. Together, these provisions acknowledge that states need not require non-exempt individuals to participate and that they may operate a program that relies partly, or even solely, on the enrollment of volunteers.

A state's decision to give priority to volunteers, or to establish some other priority, does not fully remove the participation mandate on non-exempt recipients. Sanctions can be imposed for failure to appear for an orientation or assessment, where recipients typically learn of the opportunity to volunteer for JOBS. In addition, volunteers from the non-exempt pool of recipients are subject to sanctions. While their initial enrollment in JOBS is voluntary, they must be sanctioned if they stop participating without good cause.

An implication of these provisions is that state JOBS programs may operate along a continuum between mandatory and voluntary. The continuum has several dimensions. One is the extent to which welfare agencies sanction recipients who fail to conform to the rules. A second is the priority given to volunteers in enrolling recipients into JOBS. A state could be mandatory along one dimension, but voluntary along another. For example, it could give priority to the enrollment of volunteers, but sanction those who later drop out of the program. Or it could require selected groups to enroll, but place little emphasis on sanctioning those who are not motivated to continue in the program. Where states fall along these two dimensions depends on both state policy and local practice.

This phase of the research focused primarily on the states' choices in setting priorities for enrolling recipients into JOBS. Sanctioning was given less attention, since it depends heavily on local practice. State administrators were only asked whether they expect the rate of sanctioning to change under JOBS. Additional information about sanctioning practices will be collected during the research at the local level.

Voluntary Enrollment

Only one study state, Tennessee, has an official policy of limiting enrollment in JOBS to volunteers. This decision, which covers only the first year of JOBS implementation, was dictated by the lack of funding for the program. According to *The Inter-Agency Network Handbook for the JOBS Program* of Tennessee:

> The JOBS program comes at a difficult time for Tennessee because the state is experiencing a temporary budget deficit which will limit available resources. It will be necessary during the first year to implement a voluntary program for certain individuals. As resources permit, consideration will be given to both a mandatory program and the inclusion of more individuals in the program.

Each welfare office is expected to screen AFDC recipients to determine whether they are exempt and to recruit individuals who wish to participate in JOBS. Individuals who are "sincerely interested in improving their skill or education level" are to be referred to the JTPA for enrollment in JOBS.

About half of the people who are referred to JOBS fail to appear at the JTPA, and no penalty is imposed on them. But once a volunteer enrolls in JOBS, contin-

ued participation is mandatory, and she can be sanctioned if she drops out of the program. Participants who fail to meet their commitments must go through a conciliation process, and sanctions can be imposed, even on people who were initially exempt from participation. This rule is more strict than the language of the Family Support Act, which permits an exempt participant to drop out of the program without good cause. With extremely scarce resources, Tennessee believed that this policy was important to help ensure ongoing participation in the program.

Minnesota operates a voluntary program that emphasizes the opportunities it offers to recipients. It requires that all non-exempt recipients attend an orientation to STRIDE, which provides information about the program and directions on how to volunteer for participation. But beyond attendance at an orientation, which is enforced by imposing sanctions after a second failure to attend a scheduled session, participation is voluntary for most recipients. Participation is mandatory only for custodial parents under the age of 20 lacking a high school diploma, who must attend school or pursue a GED. In addition, the principal wage earner in an AFDC-UP family must participate in a job search.

Pennsylvania does not have a policy of limiting enrollment to volunteers, but in practice full participation in the majority of New Directions components is voluntary. All non-exempt recipients are required to participate in an orientation and initial assessment and, following these initial activities, enter the "enrollment pool." From the enrollment pool, "job-ready" recipients are referred to the Job Service. Other recipients remain on hold in the enrollment pool until they volunteer for either SPOC or the less intensive New Directions track. Enrollment in the SPOC program is entirely voluntary. There are currently more than enough volunteers to exhaust the available resources for this intensive track, and state officials do not expect to reach a point where it will be necessary to make participation mandatory. Priority in the queue to leave the enrollment pool and enter a JOBS component is given to recipients in the target groups. Pennsylvania is able to meet the federal targeting requirement with volunteers only.

Priority to Volunteers

Many states do not rely solely on volunteers, but give them high priority for service. Two states, Mississippi and New York, give first priority to volunteers from the target groups and second priority to volunteers from outside the target groups. Oklahoma gives first priority to volunteers within the target groups, and within the target groups gives non-exempt volunteers priority over exempt volunteers.

Although volunteers are given priority, these states will mandate participation if necessary to meet the federal mandates or other goals. In Mississippi and Oklahoma, any non-exempt recipients can be required to participate. In New York, state regulations permit local districts to mandate participation when "the needs of mandatory participants are greater" than those of volunteers. It is generally too early to tell whether the states will invoke these provisions.

In New York and Oklahoma, responsibility for recruiting and prioritizing clients rests with the local welfare agency. In Mississippi, by contrast, the community action agencies are given responsibility for these tasks. All non-exempt recipients and exempt volunteers are to be referred by the welfare agency to these agencies, whose case managers must assess everyone who is referred and prioritize them. It is significant that this task was not given to the staff of the local wel-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

fare agency. If JOBS were administered by the welfare agency, several observers argued, it would be viewed by clients as a punitive program designed to prevent them from receiving welfare support. In the opinion of these observers, referring all potential participants to the community action agencies for assessment and prioritizing, the first step in gaining access to services, may improve clients' attitudes toward welfare-to-work programs. It will, however, create a considerable workload for the case managers.

Priority to Members of Target Groups

Several other states give priority to members of the target groups and, within the target groups, to volunteers. Maryland focuses on a group that is singled out for special treatment under the Family Support Act: parents under the age of 20 who have not obtained a high school diploma or its equivalent. Maryland requires that local programs enroll and serve at least 50 percent of these parents. To help achieve this, the local welfare agencies must give first priority to three groups: teenage parents and recipient children age 16–18 who have not completed high school; principal earners in AFDC-UP families; and volunteers from the target groups. Second priority is to other volunteers. Lowest priority is to non-exempt participants who do not volunteer. In summary, Project Independence gives more emphasis to serving certain targeted groups than to voluntary enrollment.

Texas also emphasizes enrollment from among the target groups. Local welfare agencies must give first priority to target group members and, within the target groups, must serve volunteers first. Of these volunteers, non-exempt individuals are to be given priority over those who are exempt. There is one exception to this prioritization, stemming from the state's reliance on the JTPA for a substantial share of services. "Walk-in" volunteers, many of whom are JTPA participants, will be served regardless of their target group status. This decision is intended to foster a cooperative relationship through which the JTPA provides employment and training services and the welfare agency provides supportive services. The welfare agency expects that the availability of these supportive services for welfare clients will encourage the JTPA to serve them.

Priority to Other Groups

Job readiness is used in two states, Oregon and Texas, as one of several criteria for prioritizing participants. Oregon has developed a priority ranking that divides clients into 10 groups. Job-ready recipients have first priority. Teenage parents and recipient children age 16–17 who have not completed school have next priority. The next several priority categories are restricted to people with no or only short-term barriers to employment. Target group members have next priority, followed by volunteers from outside the target groups. In summary, Oregon has an array of priorities, with low priority given to volunteers. Nonetheless, state administrators believe that motivated recipients are most apt to achieve self-sufficiency and expect their staff to encourage volunteers. To attract volunteers, a "new message" is given at orientation, one that is described by officials as "uplifting and encouraging."

In addition to the priority groups listed above, Texas divides the welfare population into service levels. The most job-ready recipients are assigned to Service Level I, which offers job search and placement services. Recipients with nine to eleven years of education and no significant barriers to employment are assigned to Service Level II, which offers case management and referral to other services.

Clients sorted into Service Level III are generally offered no services, which in effect precludes their participation.

Because Michigan has exceeded both the federal participation and targeting requirements, the issue of the priority to be given to volunteers and people in the target groups is not a pressing one. The state has not specified the order in which applicants and recipients will be phased into the program. At the state level, the program is perceived as being attractive to volunteers and requiring little emphasis on the mandate to participate.

Expected Changes in Sanctioning under JOBS

Under the Family Support Act, non-exempt individuals who fail to participate in JOBS without good cause must be sanctioned. But in practice, states can be expected to exercise discretion in how strictly they follow the federal law. For example, they may ignore non-exempt recipients who fail to appear for orientation and focus their attention on recipients who drop out of employment and training services. Or they may emphasize the importance of the orientation and assessment by sanctioning those who do not attend, but ignore the less motivated recipients who fail to enroll in a service or stop participating. The increased requirements placed on recipients by JOBS increase the potential for sanctioning. But a scarcity of resources — both staff time and JOBS services slots — may encourage staff to focus their attention on selected groups or minimize the effort devoted to the conciliation and sanctioning process.

Many state administrators expect that recipients will view JOBS as an opportunity and will want to volunteer, suggesting that the threat of sanctions is not part of their strategy for encouraging program participation. Several mentioned that the conciliation process would reduce the rate of sanctioning or that the complexities of conciliation would discourage agencies from initiating the process. For these reasons, most administrators expect either a decline or no change in sanctioning, while others believe it is too early to make a prediction. The only state in which sanctions are expected to be higher is Maryland, where participation in the predecessor to JOBS had been voluntary.

Discussion

In summary, most states have developed policies that give volunteers high priority for participation in JOBS. Tennessee and, with a few exceptions, Minnesota have developed a formal policy to limit enrollment to individuals who volunteer for the program. Participation is nominally mandatory in other states, but volunteers are given priority for service. In Michigan and Pennsylvania, most participants are in practice volunteers. Mississippi and New York give priority to volunteers, while Maryland, Oklahoma, and Texas give priority to volunteers, but take into account target group status as well. Only in Oregon are volunteers not given the highest priority for service.

The Family Support Act has been viewed as a contract that expresses the mutual obligations of government and welfare recipients. Government has an obligation to assist recipients to become self-sufficient in exchange for recipients' fulfilling an obligation to make efforts on their own behalf. But the language of the Act is ambiguous about the extent of these obligations. It recognizes that resource limitations may prevent government from serving everyone who is required to participate in JOBS and that a limited obligation by government limits the obligation that it is able to impose on recipients.

Looking across the 10 states, we see some evidence of a relationship between the obligations made by governments and the obligations that governments impose on recipients. Tennessee has devoted the least resources to JOBS and imposes no obligation on recipients to enroll in the program. At the other extreme, Oregon planned to spend more than enough to draw down all its federal entitlement. Compared to other states, Oregon's policy gives volunteers the lowest priority for service. Because the state has made a commitment to JOBS, it is able to impose an obligation on recipients and has chosen to do so.

MEETING THE FEDERAL MANDATES FOR PARTICIPATION RATES AND THE TARGETING OF SERVICES

The Family Support Act requires states to achieve specific rates of participation and to allocate at least 55 percent of their JOBS expenditures on target group members. What is the states' status in achieving these goals, and to what extent did these federal mandates require significant programmatic responses?

In the period of this study, all of the study states expected to meet both the participation rates and the targeting requirements for FFY 1991. The targeting requirements are not a major issue for any state, probably because the non-exempt caseloads are heavily composed of target group members. Responding to the 7 percent participation rate requirement did not require any major programmatic changes for states in this study with relatively well developed welfare-to-work programs. However, the 20-hour rule has been of some concern in terms of the match between the requirement to schedule 20 hours of participation and the availability of existing education and training programs, as well as the accounting mechanisms necessary to track the scheduled hours of participation. It is particularly noteworthy that, by itself, full-time enrollment in a two- or four-year college program does not meet the 20-hour rule for JOBS participation.

The federal legislation established specific participation rates that states are required to equal or exceed in order to avoid reductions in federal matching funds for the JOBS program (45 CFR 250.74 (b)(1)). The participation rates for the non-exempt AFDC caseload start at 7 percent for 1990 and 1991, and climb to 20 percent in 1995. (In FY 1990, the states were not subject to a reduction in federal matching funds if they failed to meet the participation rate.) States determine their participation rates on the basis of average monthly participation in the JOBS program.

The group of individuals counting toward the state's participation rate must be scheduled for JOBS activities for an average of 20 hours each week. Individuals will be counted toward the participation rate if they attend at least 75 percent of the scheduled hours. (This requirement is known as "the 20-hour rule.") States are not required to track the actual hours of attendance, but they must verify attendance for a sample of cases. With the exception of job development and job placement, all JOBS activities may be counted toward the participation rate. The initial assessment and the development of the employability plan, however, may be counted toward the participation rate for one month only in each AFDC period. Other activities such as participation in self-initiated education or training or hours of work may also be counted toward the JOBS participation rate. For more specifics, see 45 CFR 250.78.

The 20-hour rule and the related monitoring requirements are intended 1) to ensure that participation is meaningful and not a token effort, and 2) to ensure state monitoring of participants' activities. This latter intent is based on evidence that when states "do not monitor individual activity there is a significant no-show and drop-out rate" (*Federal Register*, 1989, p. 42201).

Additionally, states are required to spend at least 55 percent of their JOBS expenditures on the following target groups: 1) custodial parents who are under age 24, have not completed high school and are not enrolled in high school or its equivalent, or have little or no work experience in the preceding year; 2) families in which the youngest child is within two years of being ineligible for assistance; and 3) families who have received assistance for any 36 of the preceding 60 months (45 CFR 250.74 (a)(1); 45 CFR 250.1). The intent of this provision is to ensure that the needs of those at high risk for long-term welfare dependency are addressed through the JOBS program.

State Participation Rates

In the period of this study, all states in the study expected to meet the required 7 percent participation rate, at a minimum, for FFY 1991. Estimated participation rates for the states range from the required 7 percent to 29 percent in Oklahoma. These expected participation rates are shown in Table 14.

The capacity of the states to meet — as well as their capacity to project their ability to meet — this rate varies, however, and is related to at least three factors: the state's prior experience with employment and training programs under WIN Demonstration programs, the 20-hour rule for client participation, and the capacity of the state's management information system.

Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania had been operating employment and training programs that were well developed, and the federal requirement for a 7 percent participation rate did not necessitate major programmatic changes. In Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, the states are now developing programs in line with the federal legislation, and it is premature at this point to project their capacity to meet the 7 percent requirement.

In meeting the participation rates, states have had to respond to the 20-hour rule. Programs designed by states prior to the JOBS legislation did not include this

TABLE 14: Participation Rates and Expenditures to Target Groups

State	Participation Rates		Expenditures to Target Groups		Targeted Groups As % of Potential JOBS Pool
	Actual FFY '90 percent	Expected FFY '91 percent	Actual FFY '90 percent	Expected FFY '91 percent	
Maryland	UA	7	71.4	UA	66
Michigan	21.3	21.3	75	75	55–58
Minnesota	UA	17.4	80.9	80	UA
Mississippi	NA	7	NA	55	UA
New York	NA	12	NA	UA	75
Oklahoma	29	29	59.9	60	52
Oregon	NA	17	NA	65–75	50
Pennsylvania	7–10	7–10	67	67	UA
Tennessee	NA	7	NA	60	60
Texas	NA	7	NA	71	51

UA=Unavailable
NA=Not Applicable

parameter for participation, and those states are now in the process of adjusting their programs to accommodate it. Approaches for addressing the 20-hour rule, as well as for meeting the federal mandates for participation and targeting in general, differ among these states and are discussed below. States with relatively less well developed welfare employment programs prior to JOBS have sought to incorporate the 20-hour rule into their program design initially. For example, Mississippi is discussing possible programming changes with the state's education department in order to accommodate the 20-hour rule. In Tennessee, the interagency contractual agreement between the state's welfare and labor department specifies that the participants will be scheduled for an average of 20 hours a week.

A particular concern about the 20-hour rule noted by several state administrators related to programming educational activities for adults. In general, adult education as now programmed by many local education agencies is not scheduled for 20 hours a week. An additional concern is that for college education, the federal regulations allow only actual classroom hours, and not the time required for study, to be counted toward the participation requirement.

Administrators in at least two states argued that scheduling education and training should be based on the individual needs of the clients and the most practical arrangements that can be worked out with existing educational and training institutions. This approach acknowledges the importance of developing programming tailored to the unique needs and abilities of each client, as well as the importance of drawing on existing community resources to maximize the opportunities available for clients. An additional concern is that contracting with local education and training providers to offer special classes for JOBS participants may well increase program costs and lead to stigmatizing JOBS participants in community education and training programs. By way of contrast, however, one study state has chosen to contract specifically for educational services to be offered exclusively for public assistance recipients and provided for 20 hours each week.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, most states in the study do not now have the capacity in their management information systems to accurately provide the counts and calculations required to measure those scheduled for an average of 20 hours a week, those participating in at least 75 percent of the scheduled activities, and those participants meeting the target group requirements. State information systems are also limited at this point in their ability to obtain information from JOBS contractors. For most of the study states, these limitations restrict their ability to project with high levels of accuracy their participation rates as well as their spending on the federally mandated target groups.

State Status for Meeting the Federal Targeting Requirements

Most states in the study do expect to meet the requirement of spending 55 percent of their JOBS funds on target group members. The states' estimates for the actual or projected JOBS expenditures on the federally mandated target groups are reported in Table 14. These estimates ranged from the required 55 percent in Mississippi to 80 percent in Michigan and Oregon. At a minimum, the targeted groups are an estimated 50 percent of the potential JOBS pool, but may comprise a much higher percent of the potential JOBS pool in states such as Michigan and New York (see Table 14).

The states' expectations for meeting these expenditure levels, as well as their ability to project these expenditures, is again related to each state's previous expe-

rience with employment and training programs as well as the capacity of the state's management information system. For states operating relatively well developed employment and training programs prior to JOBS, the targeting requirements did not necessitate major programmatic changes because, in part, the caseloads are composed heavily of target group members. As noted earlier, the capacity of most states' management information systems limits their ability to project with high levels of accuracy their expected expenditures on target group members.

Texas is the only state in the study that added a target group to the federally mandated ones: out-of-school youth, aged 16 to 17 years old. This group is not expected to represent large numbers of potential participants; it is estimated that 5000 youth statewide in FY 1991 fall into this category. Although this group overlaps somewhat with the federally mandated target groups, its separate identification highlights a preventive emphasis. As the field associate noted:

> Early intervention with these youth is viewed as critical for reducing the potential welfare dependency in the future. In one sense, the inclusion of out-of-school youth as a target group is equally important as a symbolic gesture concerning the value of breaking the intergenerational dependency cycle.

Strategies for Meeting the Federal Mandates

States have developed a variety of methods for attempting to ensure that they will meet the federal mandates for rates of participation and for the targeting of expenditures. One approach has been to focus resources on particular groups of recipients, especially volunteers who are non-exempt target group members, or on a specific service track within a state's JOBS program. For example, Tennessee has elected to operate a completely voluntary program. Mississippi and Texas have identified recipients from the federally mandated target groups generally as their service priority.

Pennsylvania relies on a specific track within its JOBS program to meet the federal mandates. The SPOC program, which provides intensive services to JOBS clients through case management and guaranteed service access using JOBS funds, is designed to fulfill both of the federal requirements. The other service track, while permitting the same range of services, provides less intensive case management and relies on services generally available in the community rather than on services purchased with JOBS funds.

As discussed previously, other states have established different service priorities by drawing from the federally mandated target groups selectively or in combination with other recipient categories.

A second approach for meeting the federal mandates for participation rates and targeting expenditures has been to place direct responsibility for meeting the participation rates and targeting requirements on the local service districts or on the JOBS contractor through an interagency contractual agreement. This approach is used in New York, Oklahoma, and Tennessee. In Oklahoma, the state assists the local welfare offices in meeting these standards by providing them with ongoing information about their performance, thus allowing the local offices to take corrective actions should they be necessary to meet the mandates. In Minnesota, counties are required to spend 55 percent of their expenditures on target group members. However, the state does not have the statutory authority to require the

counties to meet a specific participation rate. The state can simply encourage the counties to do so.

A third approach has been to adjust programming to meet the 20-hour rule, for example by expanding the number of hours for educational services. Additionally, case managers are encouraged to design program activities for participants that meet the 20-hour rule and to promote continuous participation among clients.

A fourth approach involves developing and using management information systems to more completely "capture" JOBS activities provided by contractors that will count toward the participation requirements.

Another approach is to enroll participants in other programs into JOBS, which can be accomplished by giving them an assessment and perhaps supportive services. In both Minnesota and Texas, many AFDC participants in the JTPA are also enrolled in JOBS and counted as JOBS participants. In Michigan and New York, and possibly other states as well, significant numbers of JOBS participants are engaged in other educational and training programs and have enrolled in JOBS to obtain supportive services. Their participation in JOBS is counted as self-initiated activity.

Eight states did not project any major program changes in response to the increasing participation rates. The strategies in these states are to extend the program to additional areas or to increase the service capacity of current programs. Two states do recognize that they may have to make significant adjustments to meet the 11 percent participation rate, possibly adding lower-cost components in order to come into compliance. An example of this type of approach might be to enroll in JOBS all AFDC recipients over age 16 who are already full-time students.

Discussion

The 20-hours per week requirement represents a significant challenge to states to provide intensive JOBS components. Among the concerns regarding this requirement are the match between the required 20 hours of participation and the programmed hours for existing educational and training programs and the exclusion of supportive services such as counseling in meeting the 20-hour per week requirement. Although the state agency is not required to maintain attendance records for JOBS participants, the state does need to require the maintenance of attendance records by service providers. These extensive reporting requirements may create disincentives for other agencies to coordinate and cooperate in providing JOBS services. In addition to tracking the participants' attendance, the calculations for combined and averaged scheduled hours for participants present a difficult accounting problem for the state agencies.

The increasing rates of participation, combined with the targeting requirements, will place challenging demands on state and local agencies operating JOBS programs. Although only two states indicated concern about these demands at this point, it is not unreasonable to expect that as states begin to confront the increasing participation rates, other states may become concerned about their capacity to meet these expectations. When the increasing participation rate requirements are combined with the increasing severity of budgetary constraints faced by state and

local governments, states may be faced with difficult choices, as Porter (1990, p. 46) notes:

> Within a given amount of resources, the more that is spent on each participant, the fewer the participants that can be served. Ideally, a state would be able to devote sufficient resources to the JOBS program to fund more intensive services for enough recipients to meet the state's participation requirements. However, many states cannot afford intensive services for this large a portion of the caseload. Given this dilemma, states will need to develop strategies enabling them to provide enough resources for intensive services to the less job-ready recipients, while also covering enough recipients to meet the JOBS participation requirements.

X

CONCLUSIONS

During the 1980s, federal legislation gave the states new options in designing and administering their welfare-to-work programs. Many states took advantage of these options, introducing WIN Demonstration programs and Title IV-A work programs that suited their particular institutions and met the demands of their electorates. Based on the generally positive results of these innovative and experimental initiatives, Congress mandated many of the activities and services that until then had been discretionary. With passage of the Family Support Act of 1988, all states were required to implement a welfare-to-work program administered by the welfare agency and composed of specific components.

Looking across the responses of the 10 states to the Family Support Act, we can divide them into three groups. The first group, comprised of Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania, had introduced welfare employment programs during the 1980s under the new federal options. With the exception of New York, where public debate delayed passage of the state's enabling legislation, all implemented JOBS early, in July or October of 1989. For this group of states with well developed welfare-to-work programs, only relatively small adjustments were required to comply with the federal legislation. These states had already charted a course that was consistent with the federal legislation, and the required response was one of fine tuning an existing program. Changes have been subtle rather than dramatic, incremental rather than sweeping. The federal legislation supported and reinforced initiatives these states had chosen earlier. With the increase in federal funding, they were able to expand their programs to all parts of the state, extend services to more people, and increase the emphasis on education.

The second group of states, comprised of Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, had elected to operate WIN Demonstration programs, but had not taken advantage of the opportunity to introduce major welfare-to-work initiatives. They did not have programs in place that could, with minor modification, meet the requirements of the JOBS legislation. Their earlier approach to reducing welfare dependency and welfare costs was to maintain low AFDC benefit levels, rather than to emphasize self-sufficiency through employment programs. These states, along with Oklahoma, were also required by the Family Support Act to extend AFDC to two-parent families. To prepare for the changes called for by the federal legislation and to postpone the financial burden they imposed, these three states delayed JOBS implementation until the mandatory date of October 1990.

When this second group of states did implement JOBS, their legislatures made small appropriations to support it. Although state administrators are making a good faith effort to implement the program, their ability to purchase services is extremely limited. As a result, they have designed their programs with the immediate goal of meeting the federal participation mandates with the resources available. Specifically, Tennessee has contracted with the JTPA to serve exactly 7 percent of the cases required to participate. Texas has devoted a large share of its JOBS funds to low-cost job search and placement services to the most job-ready. The other large expenditure in Texas is for case managers who are to access resources from other programs to serve JOBS clients. Mississippi has also devoted a large share of its resources to case management for the similar purpose of referring clients to other programs.

Oregon's experience with welfare employment programs differs from the other states' and places it in a third category. As a result of efforts by welfare advocates, the state introduced in 1988 a pilot program that emphasized a self-sufficiency strategy through education, employment, and training services and that included many of the federal JOBS requirements. To gain experience with its newly introduced pilot program, the state delayed JOBS implementation until October 1990. Oregon has designed more detailed program models than the other states and, unlike them, does not have a purely assessment-based design for all participants. It is also the only state that planned to spend more than the maximum amount eligible for federal matching in the initial period of program implementation.

In general, the JOBS legislation has encouraged a moderate shift to a more human investment approach. States are placing less emphasis on immediate job placement and more on services that will increase the capacity of recipients to achieve self-sufficiency over the long term. This shift is reflected primarily in the expansion of educational components and, to a more limited degree, in the expenditures on case management services.

Strategies Underlying the States' Design Choices

Although the JOBS programs of the study states are diverse, there a number of similarities in their design. The range of services that can be provided to participants is quite uniform across the states. In addition to the mandated services, all states offer job search and on-the-job training. Nine of the states offer case management services, and Oklahoma, which does not formally provide case management, organizes its staff to deliver case management services. All of the states operate assessment-based programs for most of their caseload, and few refer participants to job search prior to an assessment or specify the sequence of other initial activities. Most states plan to rely heavily on the enrollment of volunteers to meet their participation goals.

However, the motivations for these design choices vary among the states. In many states, choices were based on a belief that a particular approach is best for clients. For example, state administrators argued that a voluntary program helps people who want to be helped, permits mothers to stay home with their children if they prefer, and encourages service providers to offer services that people want. Assessment-based programs are favored because they permit services to be tailored to the needs and preferences of the participant. A wide range of available services increases the likelihood that clients will receive those that they need, based on their assessments. Case management can ensure that clients are linked to needed services and that supportive counseling is provided.

But in other states, these design choices were a strategic response to a scarcity of resources. As indicated most clearly in Tennessee, reliance on motivated volunteers is a type of creaming designed to meet the federal mandates with extremely limited expenditures. In both Mississippi and Texas, the decision to allocate a large share of their funds to case management is consistent with their minimal funding of education, training, and employment services. Case managers are expected to access the services of other organizations on a non-reimbursable basis. Additionally, in these three states and others, assessment-based programs are one method for coping with uncertainty about the types and availability of service components. When service availability is limited, an assessment-based approach permits clients to be referred to those services that are available, which may not be those that the assessment indicates are most needed. In fact, the assessment itself may become skewed on the basis of available services (see Austin, 1981). Unlike programs with a prescribed sequence of services, no specific services are guaranteed in these assessment-based programs.

Interagency Partnerships

From the perspective of the states, the federal legislation encouraged or reinforced the development of interagency coordination. Within each state, JOBS implementation is a joint effort of many organizations, especially the state agencies administering the JTPA and educational programs. As a result of these linkages, state welfare agencies are drawing upon the expertise of other agencies to build the capacity to deliver JOBS services and child care.

The linkages between the state welfare agency and other state agencies providing JOBS services take several forms. In three of the early implementing states, Maryland, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, the state welfare agency was already a partner in a broad education and training effort directed at low-skilled people. To implement JOBS, the state welfare agency built on these linkages by transferring both funds and considerable management responsibility for JOBS to the state agency administering the JTPA. JOBS funds are used by these agencies and their contractors to purchase services for JOBS participants, thereby assuring them a certain level of service. To some extent, these other agencies also use their own resources to serve JOBS clients.

In Michigan, New York, and Oregon, the partnerships are more varied and link the state welfare agency to local organizations as well as other state agencies. As in Maryland, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, considerable amounts of JOBS funds are used to purchase services for JOBS participants. Similarly, some of these other agencies use their resources to serve JOBS clients.

In contrast, the other four state welfare agencies do not purchase significant amounts of services from other organizations. Where linkages have been established, they are for the purpose of obtaining the resources of other organizations for JOBS participants. In Tennessee, most of the resources for JOBS services other than child care are provided by the JTPA. In Mississippi and Oklahoma, the state welfare agency has negotiated agreements with many organizations to provide services to JOBS clients on a non-reimbursable basis. In Texas, only small amounts are being used to purchase services, and few firm agreements have been reached with other organizations to provide services to JOBS clients on a non-reimbursable basis.

The agreements in Tennessee and Oklahoma may be successful in assuring welfare recipients access to services. In Tennessee, services for 2,023 participants,

the number required to meet the 7 percent participation rate, must be provided under the terms of a contract. In Oklahoma, the state welfare agency is a politically powerful institution and had considerable experience with welfare employment programs before JOBS implementation. But in Mississippi and Texas, few binding commitments have been made by other agencies to serve JOBS clients. In the absence of large amounts of JOBS funds to purchase services, their capacity to serve clients is in doubt.

The reliance by the states on the services of other organizations was encouraged by the federal legislation's emphasis on interagency coordination. This coordination allows the state welfare agencies to access services already available in local communities and potentially avoids service duplication. Reliance on coordination, however, also decreases the welfare agency's ability to control the nature and scope of the services provided, particularly when these services are obtained on a non-reimbursable basis. Even when services are purchased, issues of control and accountability arise. These issues are compounded further by the autonomy of regional and local welfare districts in some states.

The Challenges of Implementing JOBS

When this study was conducted, in the first quarter of federal fiscal year 1991, all study states planned to meet the 7 percent participation rate and to spend 55 percent of their funds on members of the target groups. For seven of the states — Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania — meeting these federal mandates was not thought to present a major challenge. Programs introduced during the 1980s and expanded with the enactment of JOBS were serving relatively large numbers of recipients. According to state projections, the number of participants was sufficient to meet or exceed the 7 percent threshold. Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas also planned to meet the participation rate, but administrators were less certain that this would be achieved. With large numbers of recipients in the target groups, most states expected to face little difficulty in spending 55 percent of their JOBS funds on target group members.

While many state administrators expected that their JOBS programs would meet the federal mandates for participation and targeting, they were not confident about their ability to track and monitor program participation or to meet the federal reporting requirements for JOBS. That some states viewed these provisions as a major challenge — perhaps the greatest challenge — in implementing JOBS indicates the ease with which they were able to transform their existing programs into JOBS. Obtaining the information to learn whether the state was meeting the federal mandates was perceived as a challenge that was as great, or even greater, than meeting the mandates themselves.

The 20-hour rule, which requires that participants be scheduled for JOBS activities for an average of 20 hours each week, has also been a challenge for most states. For states that had developed their welfare-to-work programs prior to JOBS, when hours of participation was not a critical parameter, adjustments in program design were necessary. For states developing new programs, efforts were made to incorporate the 20-hour rule into the design of components.

The purpose of the 20-hour rule is to ensure that JOBS services are meaningful and, by monitoring individuals' activity, to encourage their continuous participation. States are clearly responding to the rule by establishing JOBS activities, or by

linking several JOBS activities, to provide 20 hours of service. Many are finding this to be a challenge, which indicates that services were not scheduled for 20 hours prior to JOBS and that JOBS is encouraging change. The rule is operating as intended to ensure that participation in education, training, and employment activities requires a significant effort on the part of both the agency and the participant.

The rule is also having some negative consequences. It potentially discourages states from enrolling participants in full-time college programs, which consider full-time enrollment to be 12 to 15 hours each week. To schedule additional hours may lead to the creation of meaningless activities for these students or undermine their ability to successfully pursue their studies. The rule also creates no incentive to work with clients who may be more limited in their current capacity and are simply unable to handle 20 hours of approved JOBS activities. The 20-hour rule also fails to take into account the need to pace activities based on the abilities of the client. For example, a person participating in a substance abuse program and taking several hours of coursework to obtain a GED certificate may be proceeding appropriately, and scheduling additional hours may overwhelm the individual during these initial steps to economic self-sufficiency.

Meeting the Spirit of the Law

When the Family Support Act was passed in 1988, many advocates viewed the JOBS title not only as programmatic legislation, but also as a signal for change. As a programmatic reform, it gives states new opportunities to help the dependent poor achieve self-sufficiency. In providing additional federal financial support and mandating a minimum participation rate as a condition of receiving this support, the Act gives the states incentives to take advantage of these opportunities.

But the spirit of the legislation goes beyond these legislative provisions. Its advocates intended JOBS to be a signal to welfare systems throughout the nation that they should take on a mission that emphasizes services intended to reduce welfare dependency rather than just cash assistance. Moreover, government and recipients should enter into a new social contract that would redefine their relationship as one of mutual obligation. In doing so, government would fulfill its obligation to provide the services that people need to become self-sufficient. Welfare recipients, in turn, would be encouraged to fulfill their obligation to make efforts on their own behalf to prepare for a job and enter the labor force (Reischauer, 1987). Some also envisioned the Family Support Act as offering the potential to serve vulnerable parents and their children through more extensive supportive services and linkages to comprehensive family and children's services (Smith, Blank, & Bond, 1990).

We conclude from our review of the initial phase of JOBS implementation that states have come closer to meeting the letter of the law than the spirit of the law. For the most part, the hope that states would use JOBS implementation as an opportunity to signal a change in the mission of welfare systems or to redefine the social contract has not been realized. In none of the study states did JOBS spur state leaders to alter their public stance toward welfare or to make a strong personal commitment to reform their welfare programs in light of the new law. The creative and enthusiastic response of Massachusetts and several other states to the optional WIN Demonstration and Title IV-A work programs was not replicated by the implementation of JOBS in the ten states examined here.

Nor has the theme of mutual obligation been prominent in the rhetoric of state leaders or reflected in their policies. If the strength of the obligation undertaken by

government to provide opportunities for welfare recipients is measured by funding levels for JOBS, only Maryland and Oregon have come close to assuming their full obligation. If the strength of the obligation placed on welfare recipients is measured by the extent to which they are required to participate in JOBS, states are at most imposing this obligation selectively, if at all. Looking across the 10 states, we see some evidence that states impose more obligations on recipients when they devote more funds to the program. States that are spending the least per participant rely heavily on voluntary enrollment, while those spending the most place greater emphasis on mandatory participation.

Whether states will increase their commitment to the program as the mandated participation rate rises, or whether funding will remain constant or even decline, is the most significant issue now facing the states. The current economic recession has dampened state tax revenues while increasing welfare caseloads, limiting their ability to draw down their entitlement of federal funds for JOBS. This may prevent states from offering the same level of services in all parts of the state or, in the three states that implemented JOBS in a limited number of counties, from implementing the program statewide. If funding remains stable or declines in the face of the increasing mandated participation rate, states may be forced to reconsider the design of their JOBS programs.

The Promise of JOBS

Although the promise of JOBS has yet to be realized, the opportunity remains. While we have concerns about the unfolding of JOBS programs based on the initial responses of these ten states, we also find that JOBS has sustained and fostered the commitment of state welfare agencies to provide enhanced educational and training opportunities to welfare recipients. The JOBS legislation and its associated provisions for child care are demanding and complex. To implement this legislation and to realize its potential require extensive and complicated responses by state and local governments. We must allow sufficient time for state and local governments to experiment with and to develop the JOBS programs appropriate to their social and economic situations as well as to the needs of their clients. At this stage of implementation, meeting the letter of the law may be necessary to allow the unfolding of the spirit of the law.

Next Steps in the JOBS Implementation Study

During the summer of 1991, the field network research was conducted on the implementation of JOBS in three local sites in each of the ten states. The field associates assessed the local programs in their states, again using a uniform instrument for the collection and analysis of data. The required information was gathered through on-site observations, interviews with local administrators and front-line workers, and reviews of program materials and reports. In addition to considering the local context of JOBS implementation in terms of local discretion, current environmental conditions, and organizational structure, particular emphasis in this phase of the research has been given to program design, the content of services, and service availability.

During the summer of 1992, we will again conduct field network research on the development of the JOBS programs in the 10 states and the 30 local sites. In that round of field research, we will examine changes in the states' JOBS programs as they gain more experience with the program and confront the increasing rates for participation.

The JOBS Implementation Study being undertaken by the Rockefeller Institute of Government includes two additional approaches to examining the implementation of JOBS. During the fall of 1991, shortly after the completion of the field research on the local sites, we conducted a survey of front-line workers in the 30 local sites included in this study. The intent of the survey of front-line workers is to further inform our analysis of the capacity of local agencies to implement JOBS by including the front-line workers' perceptions of how policies are implemented and the extent to which resources are available to provide services to clients.

We will also be conducting a survey of JOBS participants at four of the local sites concurrently with the field network research in 1992. The survey will collect information from AFDC mothers regarding their participation in JOBS and the influence this has had on their lives and the lives of their children. Because recipients of services have a different vantage point than do program staff about the services they receive and how these services affect their lives, this aspect of our study should provide useful information for administrators and policy-makers about the implementation of JOBS and its responsiveness to clients' needs.

REFERENCES

American Public Welfare Association. (1990). *Early state experiences and policy issues in the implementation of the JOBS program.* Washington, D.C.: American Public Welfare Association.

Austin, C.D. (1981). Client assessment in context. *Social Work Research and Abstracts, 17,* 4–12.

Bane, M.J., & Ellwood, D.T. (1983). *The dynamics of dependence: The routes to self-sufficiency.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government.

Blazyk, S., Crawford, C., & Wimberley, E.T. (1987). The ombudsman and the case manager. *Social Work, 32,* 451–453.

Federal Register. (1989, October 13). *54,* 42146–42267.

General Accounting Office. (1988). *Work and welfare: Analysis of AFDC employment programs in four states.* Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.

———. (1987). *Work and welfare: Current AFDC work programs and implications for federal policy.* Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.

Greenberg, M. (1990). *What's happening in JOBS: A review of initial state data.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Gueron, J.M. (1987). *Reforming welfare with work.* Ford Foundation Project on Social Welfare and the American Future. Occasional Paper 2. New York: Ford Foundation.

Gueron, J.M., & Pauly, E. (1991). *From welfare to work.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Herr, T., Halpern, R., & Conrad, A. (1991). *Changing what counts: Re-thinking the journey out of welfare.* Evanston, Ill.: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University.

Johnson, P.J., & Rubin, A. (1983). Case management in mental health: A social work domain? *Social Work, 28*(1), 49–55.

Langguth, C. (1991). Providing child care for 60,000 kids: Texas has devised a system to meet that challenge. *Public Welfare, 49,* 23–29.

Lurie, I., & Sanger, M.B. (1991). The Family Support Act: Defining the social contract in New York. *Social Service Review, 65*(1), 43–67.

Moynihan, D.P. (November 25, 1990). The children of the state. *The Washington Post.*

Nathan, R.P. (1982). The methodology for field network evaluation studies. In W. Williams (Ed.), *Studying implementation: Methodological and administrative issues* (pp. 73–99). Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House.

Nightingale, D.S., & Burbridge, L.C. (1987). *The status of state work-welfare programs in 1986: Implications for welfare reform.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

Porter, K.H. (1990). *Making JOBS work*. Washington. D.C.: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Rapp, C.A., & Chamberlain, R. (1985). Case management services for the chronically mentally ill. *Social Work, 30*, 417–422.

Reischauer, R.D. (1987, Summer). Welfare reform: Will consensus be enough? *The Brookings Review*, pp. 3–8.

Rovner, J. (October 1, 1988a). Congress clears overhaul of welfare system. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, 2699–2701.

———. (October 8, 1988b). Congress approves overhaul of welfare system. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, 2825–2831.

Rubin, A. (1987). Case management. In A. Menahen (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social work*, 18th ed. (pp. 212–222). Silver Spring, Md.: NASW.

Smith, S., Blank, S., & Bond, J.T. (1990). *One program, two generations*. New York: The Foundation for Child Development in Partnership with the National Center for Children in Poverty.

Wattenberg, E. (1991). Minor mothers and welfare reform. *Public Welfare, 49*, 12–21.

Weil, M., Karls, J.M., & Associates. (1985). *Case management in human service practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A

Field Associates

ROBERT E. FULTON is now an independent public policy analyst living in Missouri. He was Secretary of Social Services in the Oklahoma Governor's Cabinet from November 1987 to January 1991. In this capacity, he assisted the Governor in providing oversight and liaison for eight state agencies. Prior to joining the Governor's Cabinet, Fulton served for 4 1/2 years as Director of Oklahoma's largest state agency, the Department of Human Services. Before going to Oklahoma in 1983, Fulton served for six years on the staff of the U.S. Senate Budget Committee, including two years as Chief Counsel for that Committee. Prior to joining the Senate Budget Committee staff, Fulton served for a total of 21 years in five different federal agencies. His service included a 1976 appointment by President Ford as Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Fulton served on the Board of Directors of the American Public Welfare Association from 1987 to 1989. Fulton served on the American Public Welfare Association's committee that produced the "One Child in Four" report and helped create the momentum leading to the enactment of the Family Support Act of 1988.

CHRISTOPHER T. KING is Associate Director, Center for the Study of Human Resources, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, Austin. Dr. King is an economist with an interest in welfare, education, and employment programs, both nationwide and in Texas. He is an expert on the Job Training Partnership Act, having served as the principal editor for the report of the U.S. Job Training Partnership Act Advisory Committee issued in March 1989. He has been a consultant to many governmental and private organizations and continues to conduct research on the JOBS Program in Texas with funding from the Texas Department of Human Services and several other state agencies.

JEFFREY J. KOSHEL is an economist who is a private consultant in Washington, D.C. He has had extensive experience monitoring and evaluating work/welfare programs, social service programs, and other human resource programs while serving on the staffs of the National Governors Association, the Urban Institute, and the Congressional Budget Office. He currently provides planning and evaluation assistance to administrators of state and local governmental and private agencies serving at-risk populations. As a consultant to Montgomery County, Maryland, he is evaluating the county's initiative in adding a cash supplement to the state's welfare program.

THOMAS F. LUCE, JR. is an assistant professor of public affairs and planning at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. He has worked extensively on economic development and public finance in Pennsylvania. Prior to moving to Minnesota, he taught at Pennsylvania State University and worked with the Wharton Economic Monitoring Project at the University of Pennsylvania. He co-authored three volumes on finance and economic development in the Philadelphia area. He has also published work on fiscal issues in the Pittsburgh area, state government science and technology-based economic development programs in Pennsylvania and other states, and intergovernmental fiscal relations.

COLLETTA H. MOSHER is a professor of agricultural economics at Michigan State University and Employment, Training, and Public Policy Specialist, Cooperative Extension Service. Her expertise is labor economics, and she is co-author of *Labor Economics and Labor Relations*, a textbook now in its tenth edition. She has an extensive background in manpower policies, with a special focus on rural issues. From 1986 to 1988, she was principal investigator for grants from the Michigan Department of Labor, Title III Dislocated Workers Job Training Partnership Act for retraining financially distressed Michigan farm family members and their employees.

SHARON K. PATTEN is a senior fellow at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, and an associate professor in the department of social work at Augsburg College. As a consultant in policy analysis and program evaluation, Dr. Patten has consulted with numerous government and nonprofit agencies, including several county social service departments and the Minnesota Department of Public Welfare. She has conducted numerous evaluation and policy studies, frequently focusing on financing and quality assurance, and has also developed and tested client assessment instruments.

LEWIS H. SMITH is a professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Mississippi. He is a labor economist who has studied various aspects of labor markets in the South as well as the effectiveness of training, relocation, and job search activities. Dr. Smith has also written on welfare and public service employment programs in the rural South. He is unique among the field associates in having been a field associate in several field network research projects directed by Richard Nathan and others: the Study of the Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act, the Study of the Impact of Reagan's Domestic Programs on State and Local Governments, and the field network evaluation of the Public Service Employment Program.

KENNETH R. WEDEL, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Oklahoma, may be unique among our field associates in having served as a county welfare director early in his career. His expertise rests in public administration and public welfare policies. Professor Wedel's scholarly publications in this area have concentrated on issues related to the purchase of social services by the government. These issues include the monitoring of service contracts and the use of performance-based contracts in social services. Additionally, he is co-author of a forthcoming book on the evaluation of social programs.

NORMAN L. WYERS, Professor, School of Social Work, Portland State University, has conducted public policy research on public welfare policies, specifically AFDC. He has made a significant contribution to the social welfare literature by examining the roles and functions of income maintenance workers. In addition to his scholarly publications, Dr. Wyers has been active in serving as a consultant to various public organizations, including the Department of Human Services, State of Oregon. He also has provided testimony before various committees of the Oregon State Legislature, the Governor's Task Force on Welfare Reform, and the Welfare Reform Subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Appendix B

Jurisdiction _____

Associate _____

Field Network Research Reporting Format

IMPLEMENTATION STUDY OF THE JOBS PROGRAM FOR AFDC RECIPIENTS

Round I

Part A - STATE CONTEXT AND INITIAL RESPONSE

Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government
State University of New York
Center for the Study of the States

Submit to Jan L. Hagen and Irene Lurie by December 31, 1990

STATE REPORTING FORMAT

DUE: DECEMBER 31, 1990

The overall purpose of this 10 state, three year study is to assess the implementation of the JOBS program at both the state and local levels. Two main subjects are considered: the way states have altered their employment and training programs to come into conformity with the Family Support Act and the extent to which local welfare offices have increased opportunities for welfare recipients.

This reporting format is the first part of Round I and covers the initial implementation of JOBS at the state level. Your report should describe the status of JOBS as of the period October through December, 1990, unless otherwise specified. The state level information should provide an understanding of the changes in state work/welfare programs as a result of JOBS and an initial assessment of the state welfare agency's capacity to implement JOBS. Additionally, these state level data provide the background and context for analyzing the implementation of JOBS at the local level, which is the second part of Round I. Analysis at the local level will occur during April through June, 1991.

The reporting format is organized into nine sections:

1. Historical Context and Political Response

2. Interagency Relationships and Program Planning

3. Strategies for Implementing Education, Employment, and Training Programs

4. Response to the JOBS Program by Other State Agencies

5. Effects on Supportive Services

6. Organizational Structure and Management Strategies

7. JOBS and Client/Agency Relations

8. Meeting Federal Mandates for Participation and Targeting

9. Summary Considerations

The report requires you to describe, analyze, and synthesize information central to your state's JOBS program. At times, we request specific quantitative data, such as the allocation of funds to JOBS and their distribution within the JOBS components. Further details regarding this type of information are contained within the document.

The report specifically asks for several documents. We would appreciate receiving copies of other documents, news accounts, reports, etc. that you think are important to understanding the state's response to JOBS. However, they should not be a substitute for your own analysis and synthesis.

Our interest is exclusively in JOBS and the AFDC program administered or supervised by state governments. The Family Support Act also includes provisions for child support

enforcement and for AFDC benefits for Unemployed Parents (AFDC- UP). Additionally, tribal entities have the option of designing and implementing their own JOBS programs. In order to keep our data collection manageable, it is necessary to exclude these provisions from our analysis of JOBS implementation. The exception to this is consideration of JOBS services to two-parent families as they effect services to single-parent families.

The focus of our study is the state and local agencies' responses to the JOBS provisions of the Family Support Act. The implementation of JOBS may or may not result in major programmatic changes in a state's work/welfare program. The extent of change as a result of JOBS may depend on the state's previous responses to WIN and the WIN Demonstration option. Although the state's WIN or WIN Demo programs provide the context for understanding the state's JOBS program, your focus should be on the state's response to JOBS and its implementation, not previously implemented work/welfare programs.

The Family Support Act of 1988 is a complex piece of legislation with multiple components. To facilitate our analysis of the legislation, we have prepared a background paper which presents the legislative and regulatory parameters related to JOBS and identifies some of the issues associated with these provisions. Our intent is to provide a context for the information we have requested in the state reporting format.

At points throughout the state reporting format, we have asked you to consider a set of questions related to a particular content area. Please include this information in your answer if it is relevant to your state. We do not expect each of these items for consideration to be addressed separately or at length.

In collecting information, we strongly encourage you to interview a wide range of people involved in JOBS implementation. This includes the various state welfare administrators and policy-makers as well as personnel from other state agencies, e.g., JTPA, state education, and the state budget office. It is particularly important to get diverse perspectives on the implementation of JOBS.

A list of people interviewed and their title and organization should be attached to the report. In your responses to the items, you may wish to include quotes from people with whom you met. These quotes may both enrich and enliven your answers. But, to preserve the confidentiality of your informants, please do not identify the source of these quotes. You may assure the people interviewed that their views will not be identified with them and that no administrative (e.g., compliance or audit) use will be made of your report.

Please organize your report according to the numbering system and section titles given on the state reporting format. You do not need to repeat the questions in your report; just indicate the item number and its title. Begin each of the eight sections on a new page. At the top right-hand corner of each page, please print your name and state.

Please submit one hard copy of your report and a copy in IBM ASCII on a floppy disk. Retain copies for yourself.

If you have questions, please call either Jan Hagen (518/442-5336) or Irene Lurie (518/442-5270). We look forward to your reports.

INFORMATION TO OBTAIN EARLY

In order to select the local sites for our study, we request the following information be submitted by October 30, 1990:

1. In the opinion of state administrators, how much county- to-county variation in the structure and operation of the JOBS program is expected?

2. If variation is expected, why will it occur and is it seen as desirable or undesirable by state administrators/policy- makers? For example, is the variation primarily due to differences in degree of urbanization? Is variation needed to meet the diverse needs of recipients? Is it due to the differing resources and capacities of welfare and other service agencies? Is it explained by the autonomy of localities and their relunctance to cede authority to the state?

3. Please attach a table listing all the counties in the state and the number of AFDC cases in each as of October 1, 1990, or the most recent month available. This table should be readily available from the state's monthly or annual report. Indicate which areas are operating a JOBS program.

1. HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND POLITICAL RESPONSE

1.1 Historical Context: How did the state's historical approach toward AFDC and work-welfare programs shape its response to the federal JOBS legislation?

- Briefly describe the WIN or WIN Demonstration program in operation prior to JOBS and any other work-welfare initiatives for AFDC recipients. Please include a list of which employment, training, and educational services were provided to AFDC recipients under these programs, the approximate fraction of the caseload participating in the programs, the public and private organizations playing a major role (including the JTPA), and an estimate of the fraction of program expenditures that were financed by federal and state WIN funds and by unmatched state funds.

1.2. Political Leadership and Signaling Strength: How aggressive were state leaders in making JOBS, or its immediate predecessor, a prominent issue? Who have been the main political actors and what arguments have they made for the need to implement work/welfare programs? For example, has the rhetoric focused on opportunities, obligations, or both?

- Is there a specific strategy for "marketing" the state's employment and training programs? If so, what is the "message" and to whom it is being delivered -- recipients, the public, legislators, other state agencies, client advocacy and other citizens' groups, employers? What methods are being used?

- Please consider the role of the governor, the state legislature, state agencies, advocacy groups, and other influential groups and individuals.

1.3 Political Consensus and Conflict: Was state legislation required to implement JOBS or was JOBS implemented through administrative regulations? In enacting the enabling legislation or writing the regulations, was there general consensus? What, if any, issues were the source of extended debate and compromise?

1.4 Funding for JOBS: The background paper contains information on each state's federal capped entitlement of JOBS funds in federal fiscal years 1989 and 1990, and the actual federal allocation of JOBS funds in these years for states that implemented JOBS. (If a state implemented JOBS in the middle of the fiscal year, its allocation of federal funds is proportional to the number of quarters in which JOBS was operational.)

- In federal fiscal year 1990, did the state spend sufficient own-source revenue to draw down its full federal entitlement of JOBS funds in each quarter in which JOBS was operational? If not, what are the major factors accounting for this decision? Did the state spend more of its own-source revenue on JOBS than is required to

satisfy the federal match? If so, how much more? What are the major factors accounting for this decision?

- In federal fiscal year 1991, does the state plan to spend sufficient own-source revenue to draw down its full federal entitlement of JOBS funds? If not, what are the major factors accounting for this decision? Does the state plan to spend more of its own-source revenue on JOBS than is required to satisfy the federal match? If so, how much more? What are the major factors accounting for this decision?

- Have any funding streams other than welfare (e.g. education) been used to provide the state match for the federal JOBS funds? What fraction of the state match comes from these sources?

1.5 Timeliness of Implementation: If JOBS was implemented on July 1, 1989, what major factors facilitated its implementation? If the state did not implement JOBS on July 1, 1989, what were the major factors for this decision? (If appropriate, refer to information above.)

2. INTERAGENCY RELATIONSHIPS AND PROGRAM PLANNING

2.1 Interagency Relationships: At the state level, which agencies or departments are involved in the administration of JOBS? Using a state organization chart, briefly describe the primary role of each agency and the relationships among them in administering JOBS. Has JOBS led to any significant change in the responsibilities of state agencies or in the relationships between them? (If changes have been significant, please attach a pre-JOBS organization chart as well.) Is there an on-going interagency coordinating or joint oversight committee? How significant is its role?

2.2 Program Planning: To what extent did the welfare agency involve other state agencies in planning for JOBS? Did they play a significant role in the development of the state's JOBS program? What, if any, were the major accomplishments of the planning process? Were interagency planning relationships already established under WIN or the WIN Demonstration, or were they newly formed in response to JOBS?

3. STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

3.1 Program Design: Describe the design of the state's JOBS program, including the sequence of JOBS services and activities, the state's choice of mandatory and optional components, and the degree to which JOBS is tailored to the needs and choices of individual participants. Provide a flow chart showing the sequence of events and describe any deviations that are expected to occur commonly. Refer to the background paper for a description of several work-welfare models. Is JOBS a variant of one of these models? How uniform is the program expected to be across local jurisdictions in the state?

3.2 Program Modification and Innovation: Compared to WIN or the WIN Demonstration program, did JOBS require significant changes? Are new or different types of educational, employment, and training programs being offered to AFDC recipients?

3.3 Allocation of JOBS Funds among Program Components: If JOBS was in operation in federal fiscal year 1990, how did the state allocate its JOBS funds among components of the program? In federal fiscal year 1991, how does the state plan to allocate its JOBS funds among components of the program? If possible, provide information on the allocation of all JOBS funds, i.e., both the federal and state-local share. Provide whatever data are available on Table 1.

3.4 Allocation of JOBS Funds among Jurisdictions: For state administered systems: Does the state allocate JOBS funds to individual local offices? For state supervised systems: Does the state allocate JOBS funds to counties? If so, describe the allocation criteria and any requirements imposed on the counties regarding allocations among JOBS components. Does the state assign "quotas" or "targets" for participation, expenditures on target groups, JOBS outcomes, or other measures?

3.5 Contracting: Of the services supported by JOBS funds, what is state policy concerning which services are to be delivered by the welfare agency and which are to be purchased under contract from other organizations? Which organizations are under contract to the state to deliver JOBS services? Approximately what percent of JOBS funds are used to purchase services from other organizations?

3.6 Resources from Other Programs and Organizations: Which education, employment and training services are being obtained on a "non-reimbursable basis" (i.e., being funded from sources other than JOBS)? Is the supply of services that are to be obtained on a "non-reimbursable basis" expected to be sufficient to serve all JOBS participants referred to them? If shortages are expected to occur, where are they expected to be most significant? (This should be an overview of all services. Section 4 requests more detailed information about how selected services are being made available to JOBS participants.)

3.7 Extent and Mix of JOBS Services: Has JOBS increased the availability of education, employment, and training for AFDC recipients? Has it changed the mix of services? Are one or two services expected to become dominant?

- If possible, provide information in Table 2 on the number of participants receiving each service in federal fiscal year 1990 and the expected number of participants in 1991. Is this information reliable, or are there reasons why it should be interpreted with caution?

3.8 Continuity of Service Provision: What strategy has the state developed to facilitate the progression of participants through the various JOBS components in a timely fashion?

4. RESPONSE TO THE JOBS PROGRAM BY OTHER STATE AGENCIES

Part 3 examines the JOBS program from the perspective of the welfare agency. This section examines whether and how other state agencies have adjusted their programs to make services available to JOBS participants.

Role of the JTPA in JOBS

4.1 Importance of the JTPA in JOBS: In what ways and to what extent is the JTPA a part of the state's strategy for implementing JOBS? Refer if necessary to section 3. Please include the following information in addressing this question:

- Approximately what fraction of JOBS participants are expected to be served by the JTPA?

- Which services are to be provided by the JTPA?

4.2 Mechanisms to Focus the JTPA on JOBS Participants: Describe the changes, if any, that were made in the state's JTPA program in response to JOBS? Has the state's JTPA program sent a message to the local Service Delivery Areas that they should focus on JOBS participants? How clear is the message? Please consider the following:

- Do welfare agency representatives serve on the State Job Training Coordinating Council? Does the state require that welfare agency representatives serve on each local Private Industry Council?

- Have the welfare agency and the JTPA made a formal arrangement regarding the JTPA services to be provided to JOBS participants?

- Does the state use the 6 percent incentive funds to encourage local Service Delivery Areas to serve JOBS participants? If so, how is this done?

- Has the state adjusted JTPA performance standards to encourage SDA's to serve JOBS participants?

- Federal law requires that 8 percent of the II-A funds be set aside for education and for facilitating coordination between education and training services. Does the state use these funds to encourage SDA's to serve JOBS participants?

- Have the coordination criteria contained in the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan (GCSSP) been adjusted in response to JOBS? How? Are there specific, measureable accomplishment objectives included in the GCSSP to insure that the SDA's conform to the changes made in the state's program? i.e., is the GCSSP expected to require SDA's to focus more resources on JOBS participants?

- Each SDA must prepare a job training plan that describes its program. Do the state's planning guidelines encourage the SDA's to serve JOBS participants?

- Does the state use any other mechanism for requiring or encouraging local SDA's to serve JOBS participants?

- Are the state efforts described above focused more broadly on AFDC recipients, but not specifically on JOBS participants?

4.3 Allocation of JTPA Resources: Is there evidence that the JTPA is devoting a greater share of its resources to serving AFDC clients than before JOBS? If data are available, please include the following information in addressing this question:

- In 1988 and 1989, approximately what fraction of JTPA participants were AFDC recipients? What fraction of JTPA expenditures were for AFDC recipients? (The JTPA's year begins on July 1.) In the year beginning July 1, 1990, approximately what fraction of JTPA participants are expected to be (1) AFDC recipients and (2) JOBS participants? What fraction of JTPA expenditures are expected to be for (1) AFDC recipients and (2) JOBS participants?

Role of State Education Agencies in JOBS

4.4 Role of State Education Agencies: To what degree have state educational agencies increased and redesigned educational services for AFDC recipients in response to JOBS? How are education services integrated with other JOBS services? Please consider the following:

- What agencies or agency subdivisions have responsibility under JOBS for serving a significant proportion of AFDC recipients?

- Is there a formal contract, agreement or policy between the state welfare agency and any of these agencies or agency subdivisions about the types and extent of education services that will be provided to JOBS participants? Is there a less formal agreement between the welfare and education agencies? How are agreements reached at the state level enforced at the local level? For example, does the state education agency have the authority to mandate that local school districts serve JOBS participants?

- Do education providers have a greater financial incentive to serve AFDC recipients than before JOBS? Have additional funds been allocated to provide educational services to JOBS participants?

- What new programs has the state created to provide educational services to JOBS participants? What new organizational arrangements have been introduced to make education more accessible to AFDC recipients? What other innovations has the state undertaken?

Role of Other Organizations

4.5 Other State Agencies: Have any other state agencies or non-profit organizations made significant adjustments in their programs to play a major role in the JOBS program? If so, summarize these changes. Agencies to be considered include vocational-technical education (if separately administered), vocational rehabilitation, community colleges and other higher education institutions. (Child care should be discussed below.)

5. EFFECTS ON SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

5.1 Guarantee of Child Care: Does the state expect that many people who are required to participate in JOBS will be excused for lack of child care? If so, does the state have any estimate of the fraction of mandatory participants who will be excused? If lack of child care is not a problem, why not? (Refer to the next section if necessary.)

5.2 Supply of Child Care: What steps, if any, has the state taken to increase the supply of child care for JOBS participants? If possible, distinguish between these types of policies:

- policies that increase the child care that is available to JOBS participants on a non-reimbursable basis. (Section 3.1 of the Supportive Services Plan assesses the availability of non-reimbursable child care.) To what degree have more of these resources been made available to JOBS participants? (Section 3.7 of the Supportive Services Plan, which describes efforts to coordinate JOBS with other sources of child care, might help answer this question.) Has the state re-allocated child care resources away from other families, such as the working poor, to make them available for JOBS participants?

- policies that increase funding for child care (such as funds to purchase care, provide vouchers, make cash advances, and reimburse expenditures).

- policies that increase the supply of child care directly (such as support for the construction or rehabilitation of child care facilities, changes in regulations to permit on-site child care in schools, coordination with other programs, etc.). In describing efforts to increase the supply of child care, distinguish if possible among children age 1-3, 3-6, and children of school age.

- policies that increase the number of licensed child care providers.

5.3 Characteristics of Child Care: Has the state introduced requirements concerning the types of child care that can be offered to JOBS participants or financed under JOBS that are expected to change the types of child care used by AFDC recipients? Is the higher level of reimbursement expected to change the types of child care used by AFDC recipients? (See the background paper for a discussion of the types of child care and child care regulation.)

Please include the following:

- Has the state developed policies concerning the types of care that can or must be offered to JOBS participants? For example, do state policies encourage or

discourage the use of relatives and informal family care? Are the requirements for the child care care that can be purchased or reimbursed under JOBS more stringent than general licensing requirements?

- Has the state developed a policy concerning the degree of choice to be given to parents in selecting a child care provider?

- Is the state reimbursing child care up to the local market rate? If so, does this rate represent a significant increase over reimbursement rates prior to JOBS? Is this expected to have a significant effect on the quantity and types of child care used by AFDC chilren?

5.4 Other Supportive Services: What steps, if any, has the state taken to increase the availability of supportive services (other than child care) and work-related expenses? Please consider the following:

- Are new or different types of supportive services being provided? Please address particularly any special emphasis given to meeting the needs of children and to promoting life planning and parenting skills of JOBS participants through work-related supportive services. For example, are JOBS participants being linked to comprehensive family and children's services?

- Have the resources devoted to supportive services and work-related expenses, including transportation, been increased significantly? Which services have been increased?

- Is lack of transportation expected to limit JOBS participation? If so, what action has the state taken or planned to address this problem?

6. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

6.1 Organizational Change: Has the JOBS program changed the organizational structure and management of the welfare agency and/or the state requirements for the organization and management of local welfare agencies? (Please provide an organizational chart of the state welfare agency. If changes have been significant, please also provide a pre-JOBS organizational chart.) Has there been any change in the balance between state direction and local discretion as a result of JOBS?

6.2. Intraorganizational Leadership and Signaling Strength: What strategies has the state welfare agency employed to emphasize the changed focus of welfare programs within the state agency and to local agencies? (For example, have there been changes in the organizational structures, recruitment and appointments, and reward and penalty systems in response to implementing JOBS? Has the state agency shifted management responsibilities or brought in new staff with managerial or technical expertise?)

6.3 Co-location of Services: Has the state established any policies concerning which, if any, services are to be co-located? (For example, have policies been established for locating case managers or child care in educational facilities? For locating state employment services with welfare employment and training units?) What advantages are anticipated from these arrangements?

6.4 Staff Roles and Responsibilities: What, if any, actions has the state agency taken to change the roles, responsiblities, and functions of staff within local welfare agencies in response to JOBS? Attach descriptions of any new job categories that have been introduced in conjunction with JOBS. What factors promoted the development of these roles? (Refer to sections 6.5, 6.6, and 6.7 if necessary.)

6.5 Income Maintenance Workers: What, if any, role in JOBS is envisioned for the income maintenance worker? (For example, will income maintenance workers be expected to inform applicants and recipients about the JOBS program? To refer or link clients to JOBS? To determine who is exempt from JOBS? To track particpation in JOBS components?) Please attach the state's job description for the income maintenance worker. Does the state agency anticipate problems in having income maintenance workers maintain high levels of accuracy in eligibility determination if they also are required to provide information about JOBS or to perform service functions? What actions has the state taken to address this potential problem?

6.6 Social Service Workers: What roles will the social service staff have in the implementation of JOBS?

6.7 Case Managers: What case management services, if any, will be provided to JOBS participants? Are case management services expected to alter the delivery of services to clients? Have case managers been designated for JOBS and, if so, what is their role? Does this represent a significant change from the predecessor to JOBS?

- If the state decided not to offer case management, were other mechanisms developed to coordinate and integrate services? Are other personnel performing case mangement functions?

6.8 In-Service Training: For this component, we are requesting highly detailed information as part of our separate funding from New York State Department of Social Services. Their particular interest in this area is to learn about models and content of in- service training being provided in a variety of states. If at all possible, please obtain copies of materials developed for or in conjunction with in-service training related to any aspect of JOBS.

a. Who has primary responsibility for in-service training -- the state agency or the local agency? To what extent does the state agency provide its own training and to what extent does it rely on outside organizations?

- If the state agency uses outside organizations, please identify them and specify their role in the state's training efforts. Please include the extent to which external organizations, particularly educational institutions, have been involved in providing training related to JOBS, the specific aspects of JOBS, and the factors contributing to the state's use of outside organizations.

b. Have state agency-sponsored in-service training programs attempted to change staff attitudes regarding the opportunities and obligations provided by welfare programs? If so, how?

c. Please summarize all in-service training that has been provided by the state agency or its contractors related to JOBS. This includes state-sponsored training for state- level employees as well as local employees. Include the following: the categories of personnel receiving the training, the number of hours of this training, the content of the training (for example, general skills enhancement, such as interviewing skills; program policies and procedures; reporting and monitoring systems; management and supervisory training; topical areas, such as multi-problem families or building client motivation), and the provider of the training. If the state maintains a master log of in- service training, please submit this as your response to this item.

d. What, if any, innovative plans does the state agency have for future in-service training or staff development related to JOBS?

6.9 Management Information Systems: In what ways and for what purposes has the state modified, or plans to modify, its management information systems in response to JOBS? In addressing this question, please include the following:

- What difficulties has the state encountered in meeting the federal reporting requirements? What potential solutions has the state identified?

- How is the state monitoring program participation? To what extent is monitoring of program participation being left to the local agencies? To the providers? Is the welfare agency assisting the providers in setting up monitoring systems? Is the primary role of the state's monitoring system to assure compliance with the 20 hour per week participation requirement or does it also serve to provide information on participant's progress, the flow of clients through JOBS components, and service providers?

- What procedures, if any, have been developed for sharing information about clients or developing information systems that facilitate cross reporting of information with the JTPA, the state employment service, educational systems, and other employment and training programs?

- Are there other issues facing the state agency in its development of MIS for JOBS?

6.10 Quality Assurance: What management mechanisms or quality assurance mechanisms is the state using to monitor the implementation of JOBS at the local level? Where these mechanisms already in place, or were they developed in response to JOBS?

7. JOBS AND CLIENT/AGENCY RELATIONS

7.1 Participation Requirements for Individuals: How is the state enlisting clients for JOBS participation and what is the state's strategy for insuring their on-going participation? Please include the following in addressing this question:

a. Exemptions: What is the state's choice regarding participation by mothers with young children (age 3 or age 1) and the rationale for making its choice? What was the number of AFDC adults who were not exempt from WIN or WIN Demo as of approximately October, 1988? What is the number of AFDC adults who are not exempt from JOBS as of October, 1990, or the most recent month for which data are available? (Table 2 should provide this information on those not exempt from JOBS, i.e., those required to participate.)

b. Mandatory vs. Voluntary Participation: Does the state have a nominally "mandatory" or "voluntary" program? How is the participation requirement stated? Who is required to participate? What is the priority given to various groups of clients, e.g., volunteers, "voluntary mandatories"? Has the state specified the order in which AFDC applicants and recipients will be phased into JOBS? (For example, will certain recipients be called into the welfare office before others to be told of their need to participate or their option to volunteer?) If JOBS is voluntary for any groups, how will these clients be recruited into JOBS?

c. Sanctions: Is the sanction rate expected to change as a result of JOBS? If so, why?

7.2 Provision of Information: What policies or guidelines has the state agency developed for local agencies to use in providing information to applicants and recipients at the time of application or redetermination about the JOBS program, including child care and other supportive services? In what ways is information about JOBS to be framed within the context of parental responsibility? What is the balance in providing information between available opportunities and services and the client's responsibilities and obligations?

7.3 Assessments and Employability Plans: What does the state agency envision as the purpose of the assessment? What guidelines and methods has the state agency developed for local use in conducting the assessments and developing the employability plans? How comprehensive are the assessments and employability plans? Please include the following:

- Does the assessment include a screening for basic literacy and computational skills?

- Has the state elected to include the needs of the participant's children in the assessment and the employability plan? How comprehensively?

- Are there any pressing issues at this point related to assessments and employability plans? For example, employability plans for teen parents, the inclusion of children's supportive services needs, participant initiated activities, delays in processing clients through the assessment phase?

8. MEETING FEDERAL MANDATES FOR PARTICIPATION AND TARGETING

8.1 Current Status in Meeting Federal Mandates: What is the state's progress in meeting the federal mandates regarding rates of participation and targeting of expenditures? Please include the following:

- Was the state's WIN or WIN Demonstration program serving enough AFDC clients so that the 7 percent participation requirement did not necessitate a significant increase in participation?

- What was the participation rate in federal fiscal year 1990? What is the participation rate expected to be in 1991?

- Approximately what fraction of the total potential JOBS population are members of the targeted groups?

- What percent of JOBS expenditures were for the targeted groups in federal fiscal year 1990? What percent are expected to be spent on the targeted groups in 1991? (States must report this information to the federal government on Form FSA-302. Discuss any major difficulties in completing Form FSA-302 in section 6.9.)

8.2 Current Environmental Conditions: Are recent changes in economic, fiscal, or political conditions in the state significantly affecting the course of JOBS implementation? How?

8.3 Strategy for Meeting Federal Mandates: How is the state insuring that it will meet the federal mandates regarding rates of participation and targeting of expenditures? Does the state have a strategy for designing JOBS so as to meet these mandates? If so, what is it? Please include the following:

- Is the state targeting groups other than the three specified in the federal law? If so, why did it alter the target groups?

In addition, please consider the following:

- How does the state's choice of service components or its allocation of resources among program components insure that services will be available to meet the federal mandates?

- What changes, if any, has the state made in its programming of services to meet the 20-hour average per week definition of participation?

- Do state officials anticipate a conflict between meeting the participation rate requirements and spending 55 percent of funds on the target groups? If so, how do they plan to resolve it?

- Does the state's choice of service components reflect an explicit policy decision between offering low-cost programs (e.g., job search and CWEP) that permit the state to increase participation versus high-cost programs (e.g. occupational training and education) that may provide more lasting benefits to fewer people? If so, how is the policy stated? Does the choice of service components reflect some other goal?

- How has the anticipated availability of child care and transportation influenced the state's strategy for meeting these federal mandates? (Refer if necessary to section 5.)

- How is the state's policy concerning who must participate in JOBS and the priority given to volunteers influenced by the need to meet these federal mandates? (Refer if necessary to the discussion in section 7 of mandatory versus voluntary participation in JOBS.)

- Has the state specified the order in which AFDC applicants and recipients will be phased into JOBS? For example, will certain recipients be called into the welfare office before others to be told of their need to participate or their option to volunteer?

- Is the design of the JOBS program in effect as of October-December 1990 expected to be changed significantly in order to meet the gradually increasing participation requirement?

- Has the necessity to phase AFDC-UP parents into JOBS had any adverse effects on JOBS services to single-parent families?

9. SUMMARY CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 Overall, what, if any, are the opportunities provided by the federal legislation to the state? Or has JOBS been perceived as a burden to the state?

9.2 In your opinion, has JOBS changed the focus of AFDC from a financial support system to a self-sufficiency program? What barriers exist in mobilizing the state and local agencies in support of effective implementation of JOBS?

9.3 In what ways, if any, has the state's JOBS program been designed to change the relationship between the welfare agency and the client? To what degree is JOBS designed to support the client's own desires for self-sufficiency and to what degree is it designed to require certain behaviors regardless of the client's preference?

9.4 What are the critical issues facing the state at this point in its implementation of the JOBS program? Are there issues not explored elsewhere that are emerging in the state? For example, have there been any legal challenges to the JOBS legislation or regulations? Are states developing their own performance standards, systems of accountability, etc.?

TABLE 1. Allocation of Total JOBS Funds

	Actual Federal Fiscal Year 1990[1]	Expected Federal Fiscal Year 1991
assessment and employability plan development		
case management		
education		
high school/GED		
basic and remedial		
English proficiency		
post-secondary		
job readiness activities		
job skills training/ vocational education		
job development and job placement		
job search		
community work experience		
on-the-job training		
work supplementation		
self-initiated education and training		
other work, education, or training (refer to section 4.6 of the state plan)		
other costs matched at the Medicaid rate (explain)		
transportation and other work-related supportive services (excluding child care) matched at 50 percent		
administrative costs matched at 50 percent		

Footnotes to Table 1:

[1]Under the Uniform Reporting Requirements, states must provide information on expenditures for certain JOBS components each month (Form FSA-104). Present data from this form if possible. If data for the fiscal year are not available, provide data for the latest period for which data are available and indicate the period. If no data are available, provide the state's best estimate of its expenditures for various components.

If the state is not completing Form FSA-104, discuss its major difficulties in section 6.9.

TABLE 2. Monthly Number of JOBS Participants

	Monthly Average Federal Fiscal Year 1990[1]	Expected Monthly Average October-December 1991
assessment and employability plan development		
education		
high school/GED		
basic and remedial		
English proficiency		
post-secondary		
job readiness activities		
job skills training/ vocational education		
job search		
community work experience		
on-the-job training		
work supplementation		
self-initiated education and training		
other (explain)		
Sum of above participants		
Total number of individuals participating in JOBS (unduplicated count), if available		
Total number of individuals required to participate in JOBS[2]		

Footnotes to Table 2:

[1]Average for months in which JOBS was in operation. Include all participants, both AFDC and AFDC-UP.

Under the Uniform Reporting Requirements, states must provide information on the number of JOBS participants in various components each month (Form FSA-104). Use data from this form if possible. If data for all months are not available, provide data for the latest month for which data are available and indicate the month. If no data are available, provide the state's best estimate of the number of participants in various components.

[2]States are required to report this information to the federal government in their Statistical Report on Recipients under Public Assistance Programs, Form FSA-3637. If the state is not providing this information in Form FSA-3637, discuss its major difficulties in section 6.9.